



Department of
**Mental Health &
Substance Abuse Services**

2017 Tennessee Behavioral Health County and Region Services Data Book

September 2017

Prepared by:

**Xinqing Deng, MD, MPH and Rachel L. Jones
Division of Planning, Research and Forensics
Office of Research**

Contact: Karen Edwards, Ph.D., Research Director

615-532-3648

Karen.Edwards@tn.gov

Introduction

The 2017 Tennessee Behavioral Health County and Region Services Data Book covers service and capacity data from the Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services (TDMHSAS). Data is provided on a state, regional and (if available) county level; regional data is organized by TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Regions (PPR). Please find the map of PPR on the next page. The data book provides information about:

- ➡ the general population and population living in poverty in Tennessee (by Planning and Policy Regions and by county)
- ➡ admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services and to recovery courts
- ➡ admissions to regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS
- ➡ Behavioral Health Safety Net enrollees
- ➡ children & youth and adult crisis services face-to-face assessments
- ➡ TDMHSAS prevention, treatment, recovery and rehabilitation site indicators

To provide information about individuals needing increased access to services, some of the data indicators are also displayed by gender, age groups, race and ethnicity.

Data notes


Top 25% **Bottom 25%** When appropriate, percentages and rates were ranked. The “highest” (Top 25%) values are at least higher than 75% of all values and displayed in red. The “lowest” values (Bottom 25%) are composed of values in the lowest 25% of all values and displayed in blue.

The original data source and year are provided for each indicator. FY refers to the State Fiscal Year (FY) which is July 1 through June 30 (e.g. FY2015 or FY15 refers to the fiscal year 2015 which is July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015). Other indicators include point-in-time counts at a specific day (e.g., February 11, 2016).

Numbers and percentages or rates in data tables are presented with respect to guidelines that protect confidential health information. To ensure adequate precision of summary statistics derived from protected health information (PHI), it is necessary to suppress (omit) rates and other summary statistics based on small numbers of events (or admissions). There should be at least 20 events (or admissions) in the numerator in order to produce a stable rate. When the numerator is less than 20, the rate is unstable, meaning that a small change in the numerator can lead to a large change in the rate or percentage from one year to the other. The following small number guidelines were adapted from the Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services:

- If the number of events (or admissions) for an indicator is less than 5 (<5), the counts are omitted.
- If applicable, zero events (or admissions) are reported.
- If the number of events (or admissions) for an indicator is less than 20, rates or percentages are not reported.

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Regions (PPR)



- Region 1:** Carter, Greene, Hancock, Hawkins, Johnson, Sullivan, Unicoi, Washington counties
- Region 2:** Anderson, Blount, Campbell, Claiborne, Cocke, Grainger, Jefferson, Hamblen, Knox, Loudon, Monroe, Morgan, Roane, Scott, Sevier, Union counties
- Region 3:** Bledsoe, Bradley, Clay, Cumberland, DeKalb, Fentress, Grundy, Hamilton, Jackson, Macon, Marion, McMinn, Meigs, Overton, Pickett, Polk, Putnam, Rhea, Sequatchie, Smith, Van Buren, Warren, White counties
- Region 4:** Davidson County
- Region 5:** Bedford, Cannon, Cheatham, Coffee, Dickson, Franklin, Giles, Hickman, Houston, Humphreys, Lawrence, Lewis, Lincoln, Maury, Marshall, Montgomery, Moore, Perry, Robertson, Rutherford, Stewart, Sumner, Trousdale, Wayne, Williamson, Wilson counties
- Region 6:** Benton, Carroll, Chester, Crockett, Decatur, Dyer, Fayette, Gibson, Hardeman, Hardin, Haywood, Henderson, Henry, Lake, Lauderdale, Madison, McNairy, Obion, Tipton, Weakley counties
- Region 7:** Shelby County

Table of Contents

Page

Section 1: TENNESSEE POPULATION

1.1. GENERAL POPULATION FACTS

1.1.1	Region and county population estimates	8
1.1.2	Age, gender, race and ethnicity by TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	9

1.2. POVERTY IN TENNESSEE

1.2.1.	Regional poverty estimates and poverty map	11
1.2.2.	Age and gender by TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	12
1.2.3.	Race and ethnicity by TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	13
1.2.4.	County poverty percentages and estimates	14

Section 2: SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES

2.1. TDMHSAS-funded SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES: ENROLLMENT DEMOGRAPHICS

2.1.1.	Levels of care	17
2.1.2.	Levels of care by gender	18
2.1.3.	Admissions to substance abuse treatment services by Planning and Policy Region and by 1,000 population living in poverty	19
2.1.4.	Admissions to substance abuse treatment services by gender	20
2.1.5.	Admissions to substance abuse treatment services by age	21
2.1.6.	Admissions to substance abuse treatment services by race	22

2.2. TDMHSAS-funded SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES: PRIMARY SUBSTANCES OF ABUSE

2.2.1.	Primary substances of abuse	24
2.2.2.	Primary substance of abuse by TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	25
2.2.3.	Primary substance of abuse by gender	26
2.2.4.	Primary substance of abuse by age	27
2.2.5.	Primary substance of abuse by race	28

2.3. TDMHSAS-funded SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT SERVICES: PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS, ALCOHOL AND MARIJUANA

2.3.1.	Substances of abuse: overview	30
2.3.2.	Prescription opioids as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and county map	31
2.3.2.	Prescription opioids as a substance of abuse by gender	32
2.3.4.	Prescription opioids as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and age	33
2.3.5.	Prescription opioids as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and race	34

2.3. PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS, ALCOHOL AND MARIJUANA

2.3.6.	Prescription opioids as a substance of abuse by county	35
--------	--	----

2.3. PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS, ALCOHOL AND MARIJUANA (cont.)

2.3.7. Alcohol as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and county map	36
2.3.8. Alcohol as a substance of abuse by gender	37
2.3.9. Alcohol as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and age	38
2.3.10. Alcohol as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and race	39
2.3.11. Alcohol as a substance of abuse by county	40
2.3.12. Marijuana as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and county map	41
2.3.13. Marijuana as a substance of abuse by gender	42
2.3.14. Marijuana as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and age	43
2.3.15. Marijuana as a substance of abuse by Planning and Policy region and race	44
2.3.16. Marijuana as a substance of abuse by county	45

2.4. OTHER SUBSTANCES OF ABUSE BY COUNTY AND REGION

2.4.1. Cocaine/Crack	47
2.4.2. Methamphetamines/stimulants	48
2.4.3. Heroin	49
2.4.5. Other prescription drugs	50
2.4.5. Other illicit drugs	51

2.5. RECOVERY COURTS

2.5.1. TDMHSAS-funded recovery courts: new admissions in FY2016 and discharge status	53
--	----

Section 3: TDMHSAS-funded MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

3.1. REGIONAL MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTES AND PRIVATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITALS THAT CONTRACT WITH TDMHSAS

3.1.1. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to regional mental health institutes (RMHI) and private psychiatric hospitals (PPH)	56
3.1.2. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by region and 1,000 population in poverty	57
3.1.3. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by gender	58
3.1.4. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by age groups	59
3.1.5. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by race	60
3.1.6. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by ethnicity	61
3.1.7. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by county and TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	62
3.1.8. TDMHDAS Regional mental health institutes (RMHI) Regions I - VII	63
3.1.9. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to RMHI and PPH by county and RMHI Region	64

3.2. BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SAFETY NET

3.2.1. Number of BHSN enrollees by region and per 1,000 population ages 18+ living in poverty	66
3.2.3. Number of BHSN enrollments per county	67

3.3. CRISIS SERVICES

3.3.1. Children and youth crisis services face-to-face assessments per 1,000 population	69
3.3.2. Children and youth crisis services face-to-face assessments by county	70
3.3.3. Adult crisis services face-to-face-assessments per 1,000 population	71
3.3.4. Adult crisis services face-to-face assessments by county	72

Section 4: TDMHSAS PREVENTION, TREATMENT, RECOVERY AND REHABILITATION INDICATORS

4.1. SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES

4.1.1. Alcohol and drug abuse adolescent residential treatment sites	74
4.1.2. Substance abuse adolescent treatment sites	75
4.1.3. Alcohol and drug abuse adult halfway house sites	76
4.1.4. Alcohol and drug abuse adult residential rehabilitation sites	77
4.1.5. Substance abuse addiction recovery program sites	78
4.1.6. Substance abuse prevention coalitions	79
4.1.7. Substance abuse prevention sites	80
4.1.8. Substance abuse co-occurring capable treatment sites	81
4.1.9. Substance abuse co-occurring enhanced treatment sites	82

4.2. MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

4.2.1. Mental health residential treatment sites for children and youth	84
4.2.2. Mental health adult supportive living sites	85
4.2.3. Mental health adult residential treatment sites	86
4.2.4. Mental health adult supportive residential sites	87
4.2.5. Mental health psychosocial rehabilitation program sites	88

SECTION 1: TENNESSEE POPULATION DATA

1.1. General population facts

Table 1. Population indicators: TDMHSAS Planning and Policy regions (Census 2015 estimates)

PPR	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6	Region 7
Census 2010	506,266	1,176,033	941,364	626,681	1,533,111	635,006	927,644
Population estimate 2015	506,892	1,208,604	974,739	678,889	1,664,573	628,533	938,069
Estimated population growth from 2010 - 2014	0.1%	2.8%	3.5%	8.3%	8.6%	-1.0%	1.1%

Top 25% **Bottom 25%**

Table 2. Population indicators: Counties in Tennessee (Census 2015 estimates)

PPR	County	Census 2010	Pop.est. 2015	Est. pop. growth
1	Carter	57,424	56,486	-1.6%
	Greene	68,831	68,580	-0.4%
	Hancock	6,819	6,572	-3.6%
	Hawkins	56,833	56,471	-0.6%
	Johnson	18,244	17,830	-2.3%
	Sullivan	156,823	156,791	0.0%
	Unicoi	18,313	17,860	-2.5%
	Washington	122,979	126,302	2.7%
2	Anderson	75,129	75,749	0.8%
	Blount	123,010	127,253	3.4%
	Campbell	40,716	39,752	-2.4%
	Claiborne	32,213	31,709	-1.6%
	Cocke	35,662	35,162	-1.4%
	Grainger	22,657	22,846	0.8%
	Hamblen	62,544	63,402	1.4%
	Jefferson	51,407	53,240	3.6%
	Knox	432,226	451,324	4.4%
	Loudon	48,556	51,130	5.3%
	Monroe	44,519	45,771	2.8%
	Morgan	21,987	21,498	-2.2%
	Roane	54,181	52,753	-2.6%
	Scott	22,228	21,950	-1.3%
	Sevier	89,889	95,946	6.7%
	Union	19,109	19,119	0.1%
3	Bledsoe	12,876	14,502	12.6%
	Bradley	98,963	104,091	5.2%
	Clay	7,861	7,771	-1.1%
	Cumberland	56,053	58,229	3.9%
	DeKalb	18,723	19,182	2.5%
	Fentress	17,959	17,917	-0.2%
	Grundy	13,703	13,441	-1.9%
	Hamilton	336,463	354,098	5.2%

PPR	County	Census 2010	Pop.est. 2015	Est. pop. growth
3	Jackson	11,638	11,509	-1.1%
	Macon	22,248	23,177	4.2%
	Marion	28,237	28,487	0.9%
	McMinn	52,266	52,639	0.7%
	Meigs	11,753	11,830	0.7%
	Overton	22,083	22,129	0.2%
	Pickett	5,077	5,146	1.4%
	Polk	16,825	16,773	-0.3%
	Putnam	72,321	74,553	3.1%
	Rhea	31,809	32,526	2.3%
	Sequatchie	14,112	14,811	5.0%
	Smith	19,166	19,295	0.7%
	Van Buren	5,548	5,677	2.3%
	Warren	39,839	40,435	1.5%
	White	25,841	26,521	2.6%
	Davidson	626,681	678,889	-8.3%
4	Bedford	45,058	47,183	4.7%
	Cannon	13,801	13,840	0.3%
	Cheatham	39,105	39,741	1.6%
	Coffee	52,796	54,277	2.8%
	Dickson	49,666	51,487	3.7%
	Franklin	41,052	41,449	1.0%
	Giles	29,485	28,946	-1.8%
	Hickman	24,690	24,363	-1.3%
	Houston	8,426	8,149	-3.3%
	Humphreys	18,538	18,135	-2.2%
	Lawrence	41,869	42,564	1.7%
	Lewis	12,161	11,854	-2.5%
	Lincoln	33,361	33,743	1.1%
	Marshall	30,617	31,552	3.1%
	Maury	80,956	87,757	8.4%
	Montgomery	172,331	193,479	12.3%

PPR	County	Census 2010	Pop.est. 2015	Est. pop. growth
5	Moore	6,362	6,322	-0.6%
	Perry	7,915	7,929	0.2%
	Robertson	66,283	68,570	3.5%
	Rutherford	262,604	298,612	13.7%
	Stewart	13,324	13,259	-0.5%
	Sumner	160,645	175,989	9.6%
	Trousdale	7,870	8,042	2.2%
	Wayne	17,021	16,748	-1.6%
	Williamson	183,182	211,672	15.6%
	Wilson	113,993	128,911	13.1%
6	Benton	16,489	16,129	-2.2%
	Carroll	28,522	27,910	-2.1%
	Chester	17,131	17,471	2.0%
	Crockett	14,586	14,601	0.1%
	Decatur	11,757	11,660	-0.8%
	Dyer	38,335	37,893	-1.2%
	Fayette	38,413	39,165	2.0%
	Gibson	49,683	49,399	-0.6%
	Hardeman	27,253	25,707	-5.7%
	Hardin	26,026	25,756	-1.0%
	Haywood	18,787	18,023	-4.1%
	Henderson	27,769	28,015	0.9%
	Henry	32,330	32,147	-0.6%
	Lake	7,832	7,576	-3.3%
	Lauderdale	27,815	26,936	-3.2%
	Madison	98,294	97,610	-0.7%
7	McNairy	26,075	26,066	0.0%
	Obion	31,807	30,639	-3.7%
	Tipton	61,081	61,870	1.3%
	Weakley	35,021	33,960	-3.0%
Tennessee	Shelby	927,644	938,069	1.1%

Data source: 2010 Census, United States Census Bureau (2015 population estimates).

Data note: Estimated population growth=(2015 population estimate - 2010 Census population)/2010 Census population.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Table 3. Tennessee population indicators: age, gender, race and ethnicity (Census 2015 estimates)

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Indicator	TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region							TN
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Regional Population (Census 2015 estimates)								
Population numbers	506,892	1,208,604	974,739	678,889	1,664,573	628,533	938,069	6,600,299
Population as a percentage of the State population	7.7%	18.3%	14.8%	10.3%	25.2%	9.5%	14.2%	
Regional population by age (Census 2015 estimates)								
Individuals under 18 years	86,715	246,857	207,921	145,277	433,701	139,288	237,852	1,497,611
Individuals under 18 years as a percentage of the regional population	17.1%	20.4%	21.3%	21.4%	26.1%	22.2%	25.4%	
Individuals ages 18-64 years	260,284	717,271	590,370	457,286	1,098,034	375,850	587,041	4,086,136
Individuals ages 18-64 years as a percentage of the regional population	51.3%	59.3%	60.6%	67.4%	66.0%	59.8%	62.6%	
Individuals ages 65 years and over	97,953	207,594	171,823	74,039	217,028	108,216	109,047	985,700
Individuals ages 65 years and over as a percentage of the regional population	19.3%	17.2%	17.6%	10.9%	13.0%	17.2%	11.6%	
Regional population by gender (Census 2015 estimates)								
Female individuals	220,814	598,100	497,919	352,100	904,175	318,307	491,423	3,357,172
Female individuals as a percentage of the regional population	51.0%	51.1%	51.1%	51.8%	50.8%	51.1%	52.4%	
Male individuals	213,193	573,835	476,820	326,789	873,604	306,574	446,646	3,192,180
Male individuals as a percentage of the regional population	49.0%	48.9%	48.9%	48.2%	49.2%	48.9%	47.6%	
Regional population by race (Census 2015 estimates)								
Black or African American individuals	13,215	59,235	87,638	190,308	178,349	99,522	501,498	1,129,765
Black or African American individuals as a percentage of the regional population	2.61%	4.90%	8.99%	28.03%	10.71%	15.83%	53.46%	
White individuals	480,675	1,105,935	856,496	444,424	1,415,076	502,563	394,069	5,199,238
White individuals as a percentage of the regional population	94.83%	91.51%	87.87%	65.46%	85.01%	79.96%	42.01%	
Other individuals (American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races)	13,002	43,434	33,670	44,157	77,936	16,595	42,502	271,296
Other individuals (American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Two or More Races) as a percentage of the regional population	2.57%	3.59%	3.45%	6.50%	4.68%	2.64%	4.53%	
Regional population by ethnicity (Census 2015 estimates)								
Individuals of Hispanic or Latino Origin	11,859	48,272	44,502	67,768	92,564	18,422	57,121	340,508
Individuals of Hispanic or Latino Origin as a percentage of the regional population	2.34%	3.99%	4.57%	9.98%	5.56%	2.93%	6.09%	

Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division: Annual Estimates of the Resident Population (April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016).

1.2. Poverty in Tennessee

Figure 1. Poverty in Tennessee by Planning and Policy Region (based on 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)





Table 4. Poverty in Tennessee (American Community Survey 2011-2015; Census 2015 estimates)

Indicator	TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region							TN
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Percentage of individuals living in poverty.	19.5%	17.5%	19.1%	18.2%	13.1%	19.7%	21.4%	17.6%
Estimated number of individuals living in poverty.	98,873	211,611	185,887	123,557	217,769	123,548	200,746	1,161,991

Figure 1A. Poverty in Tennessee by county (based on 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates)



Data source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Data note: Estimated number of individuals living in poverty calculated by applying poverty percentages from the 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau) to the 2014 population estimates per county (U.S. Census Bureau). Regional poverty percentages are calculated by adding poverty percentages weighted by the population in each county and region.

Chart 1. 18% of individuals in Tennessee live in poverty




Chart 2. 55% of individuals living in poverty are female.




Chart 3. At 25.5%, children/youth have the highest poverty percentage.




Table 5. Poverty in Tennessee (American Community Survey 2011-2015; Census 2015 estimates)

Indicator	TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region							TN
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Female individuals living in poverty as percentage of regional female population.	20.9%	18.8%	20.6%	19.20%	14.3%	21.4%	22.60%	18.9%
Estimated number of female individuals living in poverty.	54,066	116,179	102,556	67,603	120,564	68,614	111,061	640,643
Male individuals living in poverty as percentage of regional male population.	18.0%	16.1%	17.5%	17.20%	11.9%	17.8%	20.00%	16.2%
Estimated number of male individuals living in poverty.	44,710	95,368	83,224	56,207	97,199	54,777	89,329	520,814
Individuals under 18 years living in poverty as percentage of regional population <18 years.	28.4%	24.9%	27.1%	29.70%	17.6%	27.6%	33.30%	25.5%
Estimated number of individuals under 18 years living in poverty.	28,288	63,535	56,358	43,147	72,325	38,747	79,204	381,604
Individuals aged 18-64 years living in poverty as percentage of regional population 18-64 years.	19.2%	17.1%	18.5%	16.00%	12.2%	18.7%	18.30%	16.4%
Estimated number of individuals aged 18-64 years living in poverty.	59,049	126,495	109,114	73,165	125,474	70,425	107,428	671,150
Individuals aged 65 and over living in poverty as percentage of regional population ages 65 and over.	10.7%	9.5%	10.9%	8.80%	8.4%	12.2%	11.10%	10.0%
Estimated number of individuals aged 65 years and over living in poverty.	10,691	20,220	19,291	6,716	18,947	13,472	12,562	101,899

Data source: 2010 Census, United States Census Bureau (2015 population estimates); U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Data note: Estimated number of individuals living in poverty calculated by applying poverty percentages from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau) to the 2014 population estimates per county (U.S. Census Bureau). Regional poverty percentages are calculated by adding poverty percentages weighted by the population in each county and region.

Chart 4. Individuals living in poverty in Tennessee: race and ethnicity




Table 6. Poverty in Tennessee: race and ethnicity (American Community Survey 2011-2015; Census 2015 estimates)

Indicator	TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region							TN
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Poverty by race (American Community Survey 2010-2014; Census 2015 estimates)								
Percentage of White individuals living in poverty (federal poverty level) as percentage of regional White population.	18.9%	16.3%	17.6%	13.4%	11.7%	16.2%	10.2%	
Estimated number of White individuals living in poverty.	90,688	180,419	150,692	59,552	168,346	78,725	40,195	768,617
Percentage of Black or African American individuals living in poverty as percentage of regional Black or African American population.	31.9%	33.2%	30.2%	26.8%	22.1%	32.0%	29.3%	
Estimated number of Black or African American individuals living in poverty.	4,216	19,664	26,178	51,002	33,970	40,207	146,938	322,175
Percentage of individuals with Other races (American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Some Other Race, Two or More Races) living in poverty as percentage of regional population.	30.5%	26.5%	27.0%	29.4%	19.7%	28.0%	32.0%	26.2%
Estimated number of individuals with Other races (American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander, Some Other Race, Two or More Races) living in poverty.	3,969	11,528	9,017	13,003	15,453	4,616	13,613	71,199
Poverty by ethnicity (American Community Survey 2011-2015; Census 2015 estimates)								
Percentage of Hispanic or Latino individuals living in poverty as percentage of regional Hispanic or Latino population.	41.9%	36.1%	38.1%	32.20%	24.6%	35.4%	37.90%	32.9%
Estimated number of Hispanic or Latino individuals living in poverty.	4,971	17,429	16,960	21,821	22,814	6,530	21,648	112,173

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Data source: 2010 Census, United States Census Bureau (2014 population estimates); U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Data note: Estimated region/county numbers of individuals living in poverty calculated by applying poverty percentages from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau) to the 2014 population estimates per county (U.S. Census Bureau). Estimated Tennessee numbers are calculated by applying statewide poverty percentages from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau) to the 2014 population estimates in Tennessee (U.S. Census Bureau).

Table 7. Poverty in Tennessee (American Community Survey 2011-2015; Census 2015 estimates)

PPR	County name	Pop. est. 2015	% Poverty	# Poverty
1	Carter	56,486	23.6%	13,330
1	Greene	68,580	20.5%	14,058
1	Hancock	6,572	27.7%	1,820
1	Hawkins	56,471	19.1%	10,785
1	Johnson	17,830	25.6%	4,564
1	Sullivan	156,791	17.5%	27,438
1	Unicoi	17,860	22.5%	4,018
1	Washington	126,302	18.1%	22,860
Region 1		506,892	19.5%	98,873
2	Anderson	75,749	17.9%	13,559
2	Blount	127,253	14.1%	17,942
2	Campbell	39,752	23.2%	9,222
2	Claiborne	31,709	21.9%	6,944
2	Cocke	35,162	26.1%	9,177
2	Grainger	22,846	20.6%	4,706
2	Hamblen	63,402	21.3%	13,504
2	Jefferson	53,240	16.5%	8,784
2	Knox	451,324	16.0%	72,211
2	Loudon	51,130	14.4%	7,362
2	Monroe	45,771	19.3%	8,833
2	Morgan	21,498	22.7%	4,880
2	Roane	52,753	18.4%	9,706
2	Scott	21,950	27.3%	5,992
2	Sevier	95,946	15.3%	14,679
2	Union	19,119	21.5%	4,110
Region 2		1,208,604	17.5%	211,611
3	Bledsoe	14,502	21.7%	3,146
3	Bradley	104,091	19.6%	20,401
3	Clay	7,771	23.5%	1,826
3	Cumberland	58,229	16.5%	9,607
3	DeKalb	19,182	20.9%	4,009
3	Fentress	17,917	26.0%	4,658
3	Grundy	13,441	28.7%	3,857
3	Hamilton	354,098	16.0%	56,655

PPR	County name	Pop. est. 2014	% Poverty	# Poverty
3	Jackson	11,509	26.8%	3,084
3	Macon	23,177	18.9%	4,380
3	Marion	28,487	19.2%	5,469
3	McMinn	52,639	19.9%	10,475
3	Meigs	11,830	20.8%	2,460
3	Overton	22,129	21.5%	4,757
3	Pickett	5,146	16.1%	828
3	Polk	16,773	18.9%	3,170
3	Putnam	74,553	25.2%	18,787
3	Rhea	32,526	24.5%	7,968
3	Sequatchie	14,811	16.3%	2,414
3	Smith	19,295	16.3%	3,145
3	Van Buren	5,677	18.0%	1,021
3	Warren	40,435	21.2%	8,572
3	White	26,521	19.6%	5,198
Region 3		974,739	19.1%	185,887
4	Davidson	678,889	18.2%	123,557
5	Bedford	47,183	17.1%	8,068
5	Cannon	13,840	18.4%	2,546
5	Cheatham	39,741	13.8%	5,484
5	Coffee	54,277	18.6%	10,095
5	Dickson	51,487	16.3%	8,392
5	Franklin	41,449	17.1%	7,087
5	Giles	28,946	16.4%	4,747
5	Hickman	24,363	20.9%	5,091
5	Houston	8,149	23.1%	1,882
5	Humphreys	18,135	15.9%	2,883
5	Lawrence	42,564	20.3%	8,640
5	Lewis	11,854	19.6%	2,323
5	Lincoln	33,743	16.7%	5,635
5	Marshall	31,552	16.2%	5,111
5	Maurry	87,757	15.3%	13,426
5	Montgomery	193,479	16.0%	30,964

Top 25% Bottom 25%

PPR	County name	Pop. est. 2014	% Poverty	# Poverty
5	Moore	6,322	10.8%	682
5	Perry	7,929	25.8%	2,045
5	Robertson	68,570	12.0%	8,228
5	Rutherford	298,612	12.4%	37,027
5	Stewart	13,259	19.5%	2,585
5	Sumner	175,989	9.3%	16,366
5	Trousdale	8,042	17.3%	1,391
5	Wayne	16,748	21.8%	3,651
5	Williamson	211,672	5.1%	10,795
5	Wilson	128,911	10.1%	13,020
Region 5		1,664,573	13.1%	217,769
6	Benton	16,129	22.8%	3,677
6	Carroll	27,910	20.8%	5,805
6	Chester	17,471	21.7%	3,791
6	Crockett	14,601	19.9%	2,905
6	Decatur	11,660	21.6%	2,518
6	Dyer	37,893	17.8%	6,744
6	Fayette	39,165	13.9%	5,443
6	Gibson	49,399	18.7%	9,237
6	Hardeman	25,707	24.8%	6,375
6	Hardin	25,756	23.3%	6,001
6	Haywood	18,023	22.8%	4,109
6	Henderson	28,015	21.5%	6,023
6	Henry	32,147	18.5%	5,947
6	Lake	7,576	27.0%	2,045
6	Lauderdale	26,936	26.7%	7,191
6	Madison	97,610	19.6%	19,131
6	McNairy	26,066	20.7%	5,395
6	Obion	30,639	20.6%	6,311
6	Tipton	61,870	13.6%	8,414
6	Weakley	33,960	19.1%	6,486
Region 6		628,533	19.7%	123,548
7	Shelby	938,069	21.4%	200,746
Tennessee		6,600,299	17.6%	1,161,652

Data source: 2010 Census, United States Census Bureau (2015 population estimates); U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Data note: Estimated number of individuals living in poverty calculated by applying poverty percentages from the 2010-2014 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (U.S. Census Bureau) to the 2014 population estimates per county (U.S. Census Bureau). Regional poverty percentages are calculated by adding poverty percentages weighted by the population in each county and region.

SECTION 2:

TDMHSAS-FUNDED SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES

2.1. TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services: enrollment demographics

Section 2 includes data from admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services. The following table displays the number of treatment admissions for the different levels of care for the last three fiscal years available. All data displayed on the following pages in section 2 (substance abuse **treatment** services) are based on treatment admissions to the levels of care as displayed in the following table. These numbers represent **duplicated** admissions - a single individual might have been admitted more than one time to several level of cares or had several admissions during the fiscal year.

Table 8. Admissions by level of care

Level of care	FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Adolescent day treatment	451	3.3%	337	2.5%	320	2.3%
Adolescent outpatient	134	1.0%	161	1.2%	118	0.8%
Adolescent residential rehab	217	1.6%	1	0.0%	145	1.0%
Ambulatory detoxification services	1,803	13.3%	1,951	14.5%	1,931	13.8%
Ambulatory intensive outpatient services	2,530	18.7%	2,826	21.0%	3,219	23.0%
Free standing residential detoxification services	3,655	27.0%	3,569	26.6%	3,628	25.9%
Halfway house	627	4.6%	802	6.0%	666	4.8%
Hospital inpatient detoxification services	111	0.8%	113	0.8%	130	0.9%
Intensive outpatient services for women	577	4.3%	442	3.3%	491	3.5%
Intensive outpatient services for women who are pregnant	45	0.3%	33	0.2%	44	0.3%
Residential rehabilitation services for women who are pregnant	44	0.3%	43	0.3%	62	0.4%
Residential short-term (<=30 days) services	3,341	24.7%	3,164	23.5%	3,250	23.2%
Total number	13,535	100.0%	13,442	100.0%	14,004	100.0%

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment admissions only include treatment admissions for Tennessee residents age 12 and older, below the 133% poverty line and have no insurance for which there a bill. Up to three substances can be listed for each treatment admission.

Chart 5. In FY2016, 65% of substance abuse treatment services admissions were male.




Table 9. Admissions to levels of care by gender

Level of care	FEMALE						MALE					
	FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2016		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2016	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ambulatory detoxification services	485	26.9%	686	35.2%	758	39.3%	1,318	73.1%	1,265	64.8%	1,173	60.7%
Ambulatory intensive outpatient services	839	33.2%	931	32.9%	981	30.5%	1,689	66.8%	1,895	67.1%	2,238	69.5%
Free standing residential detoxification services	1,163	31.8%	1,126	31.5%	1,066	29.4%	2,492	68.2%	2,443	68.5%	2,562	70.6%
Hospital inpatient detoxification services	25	22.5%	33	29.2%	33	25.4%	86	77.5%	80	70.8%	97	74.6%
Halfway house	233	37.2%	353	44.0%	239	35.9%	394	62.8%	449	56.0%	427	64.1%
Residential short-term (<=30 days) services	1,111	33.3%	1,097	34.7%	1,105	34.0%	2,229	66.7%	2,067	65.3%	2,144	66.0%
Services for adolescents only (day treatment, outpatient and residential rehab services)	191	23.8%	120	24.1%	167	28.6%	611	76.2%	378	75.9%	416	71.4%
SERVICES FOR FEMALES ONLY												
Intensive outpatient services for women who are pregnant	45	-	33	-	44	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Residential rehabilitation services for women who are pregnant	44	-	43	-	62	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Intensive outpatient services for women	577	-	441	-	489	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	4,713	34.8%	4,863	36.2%	4,944	35.3%	8,819	65.2%	8,577	63.8%	9,057	64.7%

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).


Data note: Admissions for transgender individuals are not included (n=4 for FY14, n=1 for FY15, and n=1 for FY16)

Table 10. Admissions by region

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Tennessee	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6	Region 7	N/A
FY14	13,535	1,843	2,768	1,800	1,524	1,841	1,689	2,064	6
	100%	13.62%	20.45%	13.30%	11.26%	13.60%	12.48%	15.25%	0.04%
FY15	13,442	1,985	2,523	1,867	1,682	1,693	1,641	2,044	7
	100%	14.77%	18.77%	13.89%	12.51%	12.59%	12.21%	15.21%	0.05%
FY16	14,004	2,145	2,452	1,885	1,811	1,954	1,602	2,134	21
	100%	15.32%	17.51%	13.46%	12.93%	13.95%	11.44%	15.24%	0.15%

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Chart 6. Regional admissions per 1,000 population living in poverty




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Table 11. Regional admissions by gender

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Female						Male					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	750	40.7%	903	45.5%	1,031	48.1%	1,093	59.3%	1,082	54.5%	1,114	51.9%
Region 2	1,115	40.3%	1,012	40.1%	844	34.4%	1,652	59.7%	1,511	59.9%	1,608	65.6%
Region 3	655	36.4%	724	38.8%	642	34.1%	1,145	63.6%	1,143	61.2%	1,243	65.9%
Region 4	525	34.5%	644	38.3%	704	38.9%	998	65.5%	1,037	61.7%	1,106	61.1%
Region 5	602	32.7%	550	32.5%	636	32.5%	1,239	67.3%	1,143	67.5%	1,318	67.5%
Region 6	491	29.1%	476	29.0%	478	29.8%	1,198	70.9%	1,165	71.0%	1,124	70.2%
Region 7	572	27.7%	551	27.0%	606	28.4%	1,491	72.3%	1,493	73.0%	1,528	71.6%
N/A	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	18	*
Tennessee	4,710	34.8%	4,860	36.2%	4,941	35.3%	8,816	65.2%	8,574	63.8%	9,059	64.7%

Chart 7. Regional admissions by gender: FY2016




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for transgender individuals (n=3 for FY14, n=1 for FY15, and n=1 for FY16) are not included. <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 12. Regional admissions by age groups

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Age 12-17						Age 18-24						Age 25+					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	299	16.2%	294	14.8%	260	12.1%	255	13.8%	224	11.3%	213	9.9%	1,289	69.9%	1,467	73.9%	1,672	77.9%
Region 2	119	4.3%	65	2.6%	126	5.1%	488	17.6%	359	14.2%	309	12.6%	2,161	78.1%	2,098	83.2%	2,015	82.2%
Region 3	61	3.4%	6	*	31	1.6%	285	15.8%	247	13.2%	224	11.9%	1,454	80.8%	1,614	86.4%	1,630	86.5%
Region 4	116	7.6%	100	5.9%	91	5.0%	177	11.6%	206	12.3%	213	11.8%	1,231	80.8%	1,370	81.8%	1,506	83.2%
Region 5	144	7.8%	47	2.8%	39	2.0%	313	17.0%	291	17.2%	284	14.5%	1,383	75.2%	1,354	80.0%	1,630	83.5%
Region 6	98	5.8%	82	5.0%	112	7.0%	247	14.6%	213	13.0%	180	11.2%	1,344	79.6%	1,345	82.0%	1,310	81.8%
Region 7	34	1.6%	10	*	26	1.2%	294	14.3%	219	10.8%	233	10.9%	1,734	84.1%	1,808	88.8%	1,873	87.9%
N/A	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	<5	*	6	*	7	*	18	*
Tennessee	871	6%	604	4%	685	5%	2,059	15%	1,759	13%	1,656	12%	10,602	78%	11,063	82%	11,654	83%

Chart 8. Regional admissions by age groups: FY2016




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for individuals with unknown age are not included (n=3 for FY14, n=16 for FY15, and n=6 for FY16). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 13. Regional admissions by race

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Black or African American						White					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	76	4.1%	85	4.3%	72	3.4%	1,729	94.1%	1,867	94.1%	2,029	94.8%
Region 2	160	5.8%	158	6.3%	159	6.5%	2,573	93.0%	2,318	91.9%	2,243	91.7%
Region 3	194	10.8%	163	8.7%	182	9.7%	1,579	87.7%	1,672	89.7%	1,664	88.7%
Region 4	645	42.5%	725	43.2%	804	44.6%	794	52.4%	882	52.6%	929	51.5%
Region 5	254	13.8%	190	11.2%	264	13.6%	1,534	83.5%	1,476	87.2%	1,639	84.2%
Region 6	432	25.6%	371	22.6%	336	21.1%	1,233	73.0%	1,243	75.7%	1,229	77.0%
Region 7	1,204	58.4%	1,136	55.6%	1,087	51.0%	826	40.0%	881	43.1%	1,009	47.3%
N/A	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	6	*	9	*
Tennessee	2,969	22%	2,829	21.1%	2,905	20.8%	10,270	76.0%	10,345	77%	10,751	77.1%

Chart 9. Regional admissions by race: FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for individuals with unknown race are not included (n=20 for FY14, n=11 for FY15, and n=53 for FY16). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

2.2. TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services: primary substances of abuse

Alcohol
Cocaine/crack
Heroin
Marijuana
Methamphetamines/stimulants
Prescription opioids
Other illicit drugs¹
Other prescription drugs²

¹ Please note that "Other illicit drugs" include LSD, non-Prescription Methadone, other hallucinogens, aerosols, PCP or PCP combination, solvents, ketamine (Special K), diphenhydramine, nitrites and other over-the-counter drugs, inhalants or unknown drugs.


² Please note that "Other prescription drugs" include clonazepam, alprazolam, diazepam, lorazepam, other barbiturate sedatives and tranquilizers, ethchlorvynol, chlordiazepoxide, barbiturates, clorazepate, triazolam, flunitrazepam and other non-barbiturate sedatives and benzodiazepines.

Table 14. Statewide admissions by primary substance of abuse

Primary substance of abuse	FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Prescription opioids	4,145	30.6%	4,085	30.4%	3,911	27.9%
Alcohol	3,939	29.1%	3,920	29.2%	3,798	27.1%
Marijuana	2,303	17.0%	1,986	14.8%	2,032	14.5%
Cocaine/crack	1,259	9.3%	1,132	8.4%	1,153	8.2%
Methamphetamine/other stimulants	946	7.0%	1,038	7.7%	1,452	10.4%
Heroin	538	4.0%	826	6.1%	1,184	8.5%
Other illicit or prescription drugs	344	2.54%	410	3.05%	430	3.07%
Not applicable	61	0.5%	45	0.3%	44	0.3%
Total number of admissions	13,535	100.0%	13,442	100.0%	14,004	100.0%

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Chart 10. Since FY14, prescription opioids, alcohol and marijuana were identified as main substances of abuse for 73.5% (average).




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Not applicable: no substance use reported.

Table 15. Regional percentages of admissions by primary substances of abuse

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Prescription opioids			Alcohol			Marijuana			Cocaine/crack			Methamphetamine/o ther stimulants			Heroin			Other illicit and prescription drugs		
	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY14	FY15	FY16
Region 1	35%	38%	36%	29%	26%	25%	20%	17%	17%	4%	5%	4%	5%	7%	10%	1%	1%	1%	6%	6%	6%
Region 2	57%	55%	47%	19%	21%	22%	10%	10%	12%	4%	3%	2%	5%	5%	8%	2%	4%	7%	2%	2%	2%
Region 3	40%	37%	34%	26%	26%	22%	12%	9%	10%	5%	4%	4%	13%	17%	21%	2%	3%	5%	2%	3%	3%
Region 4	15%	15%	15%	33%	31%	29%	21%	21%	21%	20%	19%	20%	2%	2%	3%	5%	8%	11%	3%	4%	4%
Region 5	28%	31%	32%	31%	31%	29%	18%	14%	13%	9%	7%	7%	7%	8%	10%	3%	6%	6%	3%	2%	2%
Region 6	19%	19%	18%	33%	34%	29%	19%	16%	16%	9%	9%	8%	15%	15%	20%	2%	4%	6%	2%	3%	3%
Region 7	8%	8%	8%	37%	38%	36%	22%	19%	15%	18%	14%	14%	3%	2%	4%	12%	17%	22%	1%	1%	1%
Tennessee	31%	30%	28%	29%	29%	27%	17%	15%	15%	9%	8%	8%	7%	8%	10%	4%	6%	8%	3%	3%	3%

Chart 11. Percentages of primary substances of abuse by region: FY2016




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for individuals with no substance use reported are not included (n=61 for FY14, n=45 for FY15, and n=44 for FY16)

Table 16. Primary substance of abuse by gender

Primary substance of abuse	FEMALE						MALE					
	FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2016		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Alcohol	1,037	26.3%	1,063	27.1%	1,005	26.5%	2,901	73.7%	2,857	72.9%	2,793	73.5%
Cocaine/crack	472	37.5%	455	40.2%	414	35.9%	787	62.5%	677	59.8%	738	64.1%
Heroin	192	35.7%	307	37.2%	446	37.7%	346	64.3%	519	62.8%	738	62.3%
Marijuana	588	25.5%	471	23.7%	514	25.3%	1,715	74.5%	1,515	76.3%	1,518	74.7%
Methamphetamines/other stimulants	409	43.2%	462	44.5%	624	43.4%	537	56.8%	576	55.5%	828	56.6%
Prescription opioids	1,837	44.3%	1,886	46.2%	1,720	44.0%	2,306	55.7%	2,199	53.8%	2,191	56.0%
Other illicit or prescription drugs	160	46.5%	207	50.6%	202	48.9%	184	53.5%	202	49.4%	228	51.1%
Not applicable	18	*	12	*	19	*	43	70.5%	33	73.3%	25	56.8%
Tennessee	4,713	34.8%	4,863	36.2%	4,944	35.3%	8,853	65.2%	8,578	63.8%	9,059	64.7%

Chart 12. Primary substances of abuse by gender: FY2016




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for transgender individuals (n=3 for FY14, n=1 for FY15, and n=1 for FY16) are not included.

Table 17. Primary substance of abuse by age group

Primary substance of abuse	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	Age 12-17						Age 18-24						Age 25+					
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Alcohol	85	2.2%	59	1.5%	61	1.6%	264	6.7%	262	6.7%	232	6.1%	3,588	91.1%	3,687	33.8%	3,502	92.3%
Cocaine/crack	9	*	<5	*	<5	*	72	5.7%	62	5.5%	40	3.5%	1,178	93.6%	1,201	11.0%	1,111	96.4%
Heroin	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	102	19.0%	127	15.4%	187	15.8%	433	80.6%	453	4.2%	994	84.0%
Marijuana	675	29.3%	438	22.1%	514	25.3%	569	24.7%	440	22.2%	463	22.8%	1,059	46.0%	1,122	10.3%	1,055	51.9%
Methamphetamines/ other stimulants	17	*	8	*	19	*	181	19.1%	167	16.1%	198	13.6%	748	79.1%	862	83.1%	1,235	85.1%
Prescription opioids	32	0.8%	17	*	14	*	808	19.5%	649	15.9%	480	12.3%	3,305	79.7%	3,417	83.7%	3,415	87.4%
Other illicit or prescription drugs	47	13.7%	50	12.2%	41	9.5%	102	16.3%	50	12.2%	56	13.0%	433	70.1%	310	75.6%	333	77.4%
Not applicable	0	*	29	64.4%	32	72.7%	56	11.5%	<5	*	<5	*	241	82.0%	14	*	9	*
Total admissions	871	6.4%	604	4.5%	685	4.9%	2,059	15.2%	1,759	13.1%	1,659	11.9%	10,602	78.3%	11,063	82.4%	11,654	83.3%

Chart 13. Primary substances of abuse by age groups: FY2016




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for individuals with unknown age are not included (n=3 for FY14, n=16 for FY15, and n=6 for FY16). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 18. Primary substance of abuse by race

Primary substance of abuse	Black or African American						White					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Alcohol	977	24.81%	937	23.91%	894	23.59%	2,877	73.06%	2,891	73.77%	2,795	73.77%
Cocaine/crack	771	61.34%	704	62.19%	748	64.87%	466	37.07%	413	36.48%	385	33.39%
Heroin	62	11.52%	72	8.72%	118	10.03%	469	87.17%	740	89.59%	1,038	88.27%
Marijuana	969	42.26%	883	44.53%	884	43.65%	1,218	53.12%	1,025	51.69%	1,070	52.84%
Methamphetamines/other stimulants	11	*	14	*	27	1.87%	926	97.99%	1,006	97.10%	1,396	96.61%
Prescription opioids	119	2.87%	134	3.28%	141	4.9%	3,978	96.06%	3,909	95.81%	3,654	93.9%
Other illicit or prescription drugs	44	12.9%	60	14.6%	31	7.2%	292	85.4%	342	83.4%	388	90.7%
Not applicable	16	*	25	55.56%	13	*	44	72.13%	19	*	25	56.82%
Total	2,905	21.97%	2,829	21.06%	2,905	20.82%	10,751	75.99%	10,345	77.02%	10,751	77.06%

Chart 14. Primary substances of abuse by race: FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for individuals with unknown race are not included (n=20 for FY14, n=11 for FY15, and n=53 for FY16). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

2.3. TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services: prescription opioids, alcohol and marijuana


Table 19. Statewide admissions by substance of abuse

Substance of abuse	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Prescription opioids	5,857	5,907	5,792
Alcohol	6,213	6,004	5,894
Marijuana	5,361	5,206	5,327
Cocaine/crack	2,722	2,634	2,614
Methamphetamine/other stimulants	1,849	2,089	2,869
Heroin	721	1,069	1,518
Other illicit or prescription drugs	2,470	2,538	2,486

These numbers reflect duplicated admissions with substances identified as either primary, secondary or tertiary substance of abuse.

Chart 15. Statewide admissions by substance of abuse: FY2016

Alcohol, prescription opioids and marijuana were the top three substances of abuse in FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Chart 16. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS identified as a substance of abuse by region





Figure 2. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS identified as a substance of abuse by county: FY2016




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Rates for counties not reported for events <20. Significance calculated by using z-score test for two population proportions.

Table 20. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS identified as a substance of abuse: gender

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Female						Male					
	FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2016		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2016	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	438	47.1%	572	53.9%	626	54.0%	491	52.9%	572	53.9%	534	46.0%
Region 2	845	43.8%	749	42.9%	584	38.5%	1,084	56.2%	749	42.9%	931	61.5%
Region 3	423	44.1%	436	45.2%	348	37.9%	537	55.9%	436	45.2%	570	62.1%
Region 4	194	50.8%	217	51.2%	227	53.5%	188	49.2%	217	51.2%	197	46.5%
Region 5	313	42.0%	307	38.5%	356	38.4%	432	58.0%	307	38.5%	570	61.6%
Region 6	201	37.4%	210	38.8%	192	39.3%	337	62.6%	210	38.8%	297	60.7%
Region 7	132	35.2%	140	37.9%	126	35.6%	242	64.5%	140	37.9%	228	64.4%
N/A	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	0	*	<5	*	5	*
Tennessee	2,546	43.5%	2,633	44.6%	2,460	42.5%	3,311	56.5%	2,633	44.6%	3,332	57.5%
												Top 25% Bottom 25%

Chart 17. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS as a substance of abuse: Regional gender percentages in FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions

Table 21. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS identified as a substance of abuse: age groups

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Age 12-17						Age 18-24						Age 25+					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	48	5.2%	43	4.1%	25	2.2%	181	19.5%	159	15.0%	115	9.9%	700	75.3%	704	75.1%	1,020	87.9%
Region 2	21	1.1%	7	*	15	*	375	19.4%	272	15.6%	190	12.6%	1,534	79.5%	1,551	79.7%	1,308	86.5%
Region 3	22	2.3%	<5	*	<5	*	187	19.5%	148	15.4%	129	14.1%	751	78.2%	748	77.9%	786	85.6%
Region 4	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	64	16.8%	69	16.3%	48	11.3%	316	82.7%	327	81.8%	372	87.7%
Region 5	6	*	<5	*	15	*	147	19.7%	144	18.0%	134	14.5%	592	79.5%	595	79.3%	777	83.9%
Region 6	11	*	<5	*	7	*	90	16.7%	59	10.9%	48	9.8%	437	81.2%	458	83.0%	434	88.8%
Region 7	5	*	<5	*	<5	*	56	14.9%	45	12.3%	53	15.0%	314	83.7%	315	84.0%	298	84.2%
N/A	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
Tennessee	115	2.0%	59	1.0%	72	1.2%	1,100	18.8%	896	15.2%	719	12.4%	4,644	79.3%	4,698	79.4%	4,999	86.3%

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Chart 18. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS as a substance of abuse: Regional age group percentages in FY2016




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for individual with age unknown are not included (n=4 for FY15, n=2 for FY16). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 22. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS identified as a substance of abuse: race

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Black or African American						White					
	FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2016		FY 2014		FY 2015		FY 2016	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	15	*	13	*	13	*	896	96.8%	1,038	97.9%	1,135	98.1%
Region 2	46	2.4%	44	2.5%	38	2.5%	1,870	96.9%	1,680	96.3%	1,460	96.6%
Region 3	12	*	20	2.1%	25	2.7%	937	97.6%	929	96.6%	876	95.8%
Region 4	36	9.4%	43	10.2%	64	15.2%	332	86.9%	371	87.7%	345	81.9%
Region 5	30	4.0%	21	2.6%	48	5.2%	704	94.6%	773	96.9%	858	93.1%
Region 6	37	6.9%	22	4.1%	33	6.8%	496	92.4%	517	95.6%	450	92.2%
Region 7	111	29.6%	110	30.1%	128	36.3%	259	69.1%	249	68.2%	221	62.6%
N/A	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
Tennessee	287	4.9%	273	4.6%	349	6.0%	5,494	93.9%	5,561	94.3%	5,349	92.7%

Chart 19. Admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS as a substance of abuse: Regional race percentages in FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for individuals with unknown race are not included (n=6 for FY14, n=6 for FY15, and n=22 for FY16). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 23. Number and percentages of admissions with PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS as a substance of abuse

PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	50	50.0%	77	62.6%	117	62.9%
	Greene	145	59.9%	124	54.4%	139	56.5%
	Hancock	17	*	15	*	8	*
	Hawkins	98	73.1%	129	71.7%	107	68.6%
	Johnson	20	37.0%	16	*	17	*
	Sullivan	317	47.4%	349	51.6%	386	53.0%
	Unicoi	16	*	15	*	22	44.9%
	Washington	266	44.8%	336	48.1%	364	50.1%
	Region 1	929	50.4%	1061	53.5%	1,160	54.1%
2	Anderson	132	72.5%	104	66.2%	93	56.0%
	Blount	236	73.1%	215	64.2%	204	54.8%
	Campbell	98	89.9%	100	83.3%	86	80.4%
	Claiborne	48	87.3%	58	93.5%	28	75.7%
	Cocke	34	68.0%	48	71.6%	51	68.0%
	Grainger	37	77.1%	38	80.9%	24	58.5%
	Hamblen	175	67.3%	121	69.1%	96	59.3%
	Jefferson	56	73.7%	41	70.7%	61	66.3%
	Knox	788	65.9%	702	65.2%	613	60.4%
	Loudon	39	70.9%	30	71.4%	29	64.4%
	Monroe	36	51.4%	25	61.0%	35	55.6%
	Morgan	28	80.0%	38	79.2%	34	75.6%
	Roane	46	71.9%	50	78.1%	49	64.5%
	Scott	26	83.9%	28	93.3%	11	*
	Sevier	116	67.4%	118	73.3%	77	68.8%
	Union	35	81.4%	30	76.9%	24	88.9%
	Region 2	1,930	69.7%	1,746	69.2%	1,515	61.8%
3	Bledsoe	6	*	6	*	11	*
	Bradley	26	35.6%	49	45.4%	52	48.1%
	Clay	21	53.8%	24	55.8%	34	68.0%
	Cumberland	71	75.5%	52	71.2%	53	66.3%
	DeKalb	52	74.3%	70	68.0%	54	70.1%
	Fentress	46	80.7%	36	90.0%	36	90.0%
	Grundy	23	69.7%	30	83.3%	13	*
	Hamilton	287	37.1%	320	39.6%	251	31.2%
	Region 3	960	53.3%	964	51.6%	918	48.7%
3	Jackson	18	*	20	76.9%	36	63.2%
	Macon	19	*	12	*	13	*
	Marion	25	51.0%	26	53.1%	21	45.7%
	McMinn	46	71.9%	51	67.1%	34	59.6%
	Meigs	<5	44.4%	8	66.7%	7	*
	Overton	23	82.1%	11	*	20	58.8%
	Pickett	7	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Polk	7	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Putnam	117	70.9%	95	59.4%	103	58.9%
	Rhea	23	67.6%	33	68.8%	21	53.8%
	Sequatchie	<5	*	7	*	8	*
	Smith	16	*	15	*	26	81.3%
	Van Buren	10	*	9	*	9	*
	Warren	51	56.7%	46	48.9%	61	55.5%
	White	58	76.3%	41	62.1%	51	83.6%
	Region 4 (Davidson)	382	25.1%	424	25.2%	424	23.4%
	Region 5	5,859	43.3%	5,907	43.9%	5,792	41.4%
5	Bedford	14	*	14	*	25	51.0%
	Cannon	13	*	12	*	10	*
	Cheatham	23	51.1%	23	76.7%	36	59.0%
	Coffee	44	25.0%	60	38.0%	96	48.0%
	Dickson	28	48.3%	28	47.5%	44	62.0%
	Franklin	31	45.6%	24	45.3%	39	52.7%
	Giles	12	*	12	*	12	*
	Hickman	17	*	20	57.1%	18	*
	Houston	<5	*	<5	*	5	*
	Humphreys	5	*	11	*	10	*
	Lawrence	37	56.1%	32	69.6%	38	55.1%
	Lewis	20	52.6%	20	55.6%	13	*
	Lincoln	6	*	10	*	24	53.3%
	Marshall	7	*	12	*	17	*
	Maurry	54	30.5%	47	40.2%	48	32.0%
	Montgomery	72	47.4%	69	48.9%	54	43.5%
	Moore	<5	*	<5	*	0	*
5	Perry	6	*	7	*	8	*
	Robertson	29	58.0%	35	50.0%	47	47.0%
	Rutherford	131	37.4%	141	40.2%	140	47.0%
	Stewart	6	*	10	*	11	*
	Sumner	86	45.5%	84	44.2%	118	45.4%
	Trousdale	<5	*	9	*	9	*
	Wayne	9	*	9	*	10	*
	Williamson	32	38.1%	45	49.5%	31	35.6%
	Wilson	60	52.6%	60	52.2%	63	48.1%
	Region 5	745	40.5%	798	47.1%	926	47.4%
	Benton	19	*	15	*	25	59.5%
	Carroll	28	45.2%	20	35.1%	19	*
	Chester	17	*	23	37.7%	25	47.2%
	Crockett	14	*	14	*	18	*
	Decatur	6	*	7	*	10	*
	Dyer	24	23.1%	32	34.8%	21	26.9%
	Fayette	17	*	17	*	12	*
	Gibson	43	23.5%	57	25.8%	47	20.6%
6	Hardeman	8	*	19	38.8%	17	*
	Hardin	46	63.0%	41	60.3%	36	52.2%
	Haywood	11	*	6	*	9	*
	Henderson	32	41.0%	39	45.3%	34	34.7%
	Henry	25	35.2%	26	52.0%	25	39.7%
	Lake	13	*	10	*	5	*
	Lauderdale	29	29.6%	17	*	18	*
	Madison	89	20.4%	96	23.6%	103	25.5%
	McNairy	40	65.6%	34	73.9%	18	*
	Obion	31	36.0%	26	36.1%	11	*
	Tipton	16	*	20	25.3%	21	23.6%
	Weakley	30	54.5%	22	56.4%	15	*
	Region 6	538	31.9%	541	33.0%	489	30.5%
	Region 7 (Shelby)	375	18.2%	369	18.1%	354	16.6%
	County unknown	0	*	<5	*	6	*
	Tennessee	5,859	43.3%	5,907	43.9%	5,792	41.4%

Top 25% **Bottom 25%**

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Chart 20. Admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse





Figure 3. Admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse: FY2016




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Rates for counties not reported for events <20. Significance calculated by using z-score test for two population proportions.

Table 23. Admissions with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse: gender

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Female						Male					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	277	34.3%	264	33.8%	304	36.2%	530	65.7%	518	66.2%	536	63.8%
Region 2	274	29.3%	289	32.0%	225	26.8%	662	70.7%	614	68.0%	613	73.2%
Region 3	193	26.1%	201	28.2%	181	27.8%	547	73.9%	512	71.8%	469	72.2%
Region 4	240	31.7%	278	33.1%	261	31.9%	516	68.3%	563	66.9%	556	68.1%
Region 5	240	25.8%	215	26.0%	213	23.8%	690	74.2%	612	74.0%	683	76.2%
Region 6	198	21.7%	186	21.9%	155	20.5%	716	78.3%	663	78.1%	602	79.5%
Region 7	299	26.5%	249	23.0%	291	26.8%	828	73.5%	835	77.0%	795	73.2%
N/A	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	0	*	<5	*	8	80.0%
Tennessee	1,723	27.7%	1,684	28.0%	1,632	27.7%	4,489	72.3%	4,320	72.0%	4,262	72.3%

Chart 21. Admissions with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse: Regional gender percentages in FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for transgender individuals are not included (n=1 for FY14). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 24. Admissions with ALCOHOL identified as a substance of abuse: age groups

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Age 12-17						Age 18-24						Age 25+					
	FY2013		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	133	16.5%	132	16.9%	130	15.5%	62	7.7%	59	7.5%	77	9.2%	612	75.8%	591	75.6%	633	75.4%
Region 2	74	7.9%	28	3.1%	58	6.9%	112	12.0%	94	10.4%	77	9.2%	750	80.1%	781	86.5%	703	83.9%
Region 3	20	2.7%	<5	*	10	*	69	9.3%	56	7.9%	38	5.8%	651	88.0%	654	91.7%	602	92.6%
Region 4	27	3.6%	29	3.5%	36	4.4%	34	4.5%	60	7.2%	56	6.9%	696	91.9%	750	89.4%	724	88.7%
Region 5	83	8.9%	11	*	13	*	115	12.4%	118	14.3%	114	12.7%	731	78.7%	697	84.4%	768	85.8%
Region 6	53	5.8%	33	3.9%	33	4.4%	98	10.7%	95	11.2%	58	7.7%	763	83.5%	720	84.9%	666	88.0%
Region 7	17	*	6	*	7	*	103	9.2%	83	7.7%	71	6.5%	1,005	89.3%	989	91.7%	1,006	92.8%
N/A	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	5	*	9	*
Tennessee	407	6.6%	242	4.0%	287	4.9%	593	9.5%	565	9.4%	492	8.4%	5,210	83.9%	5,187	86.5%	5,111	86.8%

Chart 22. Admissions with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse: Regional age group percentages in FY2016

Top 25% Bottom 25%




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for individuals with unknown age are not included (n=3 for FY14, n=10 for FY15, and n=4 for FY16). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 25. Admissions with ALCOHOL identified as a substance of abuse: race

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Black or African American						White					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	45	5.6%	47	6.0%	32	3.8%	749	92.9%	721	92.2%	785	93.7%
Region 2	76	8.1%	85	9.4%	83	9.9%	840	89.9%	800	88.7%	730	87.2%
Region 3	114	15.4%	77	10.8%	85	13.1%	618	83.5%	624	87.5%	551	84.8%
Region 4	299	39.6%	357	42.6%	369	45.2%	425	56.3%	446	53.2%	413	50.6%
Region 5	135	14.5%	112	13.6%	137	15.3%	761	82.0%	697	84.4%	731	81.8%
Region 6	263	28.8%	227	26.7%	190	25.2%	634	69.4%	603	71.0%	548	72.8%
Region 7	665	59.1%	615	56.7%	568	52.4%	439	39.0%	453	41.8%	495	45.6%
N/A	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	7	*
Tennessee	1,598	25.8%	1,521	25.4%	1,465	24.9%	4,467	72.0%	4,348	72.5%	4,260	72.4%

Chart 23. Admissions with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse: Regional race percentages in FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for individuals with unknown race are not included (n=8 for FY14, n=4 for FY15, and n=13 for FY16). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 26. Number and percentages of admissions with ALCOHOL as a substance of abuse

PPR	County	FY14		FY15		FY16		PPR	County	FY14		FY15		FY16		PPR	County	FY14		FY15		FY16	
		#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	43	43.0%	46	37.4%	53	28.5%	3	Jackson	15	*	5	*	20	35.1%	5	Perry	5	*	7	*	11	*
	Greene	91	37.6%	82	36.0%	77	31.3%		Macon	14	*	10	*	7	*		Robertson	25	50.0%	32	45.7%	45	45.0%
	Hancock	8	34.8%	<5	*	<5	*		Marion	17	*	18	*	12	*		Rutherford	184	52.6%	201	57.3%	143	48.0%
	Hawkins	31	23.1%	46	25.6%	45	28.8%		McMinn	19	*	18	*	8	*		Stewart	7	*	5	*	6	*
	Johnson	18	33.3%	12	*	14	*		Meigs	5	*	<5	*	0	*		Sumner	102	54.0%	82	43.2%	130	50.0%
	Sullivan	297	44.4%	269	39.8%	313	43.0%		Overton	10	*	10	*	13	*		Trousdale	<5	*	6	*	<5	*
	Unicoi	13	*	13	*	28	57.1%		Pickett	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*		Wayne	5	*	6	*	<5	*
	Washington	306	51.5%	312	44.6%	306	42.1%		Polk	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*		Williamson	44	52.4%	48	52.7%	43	49.4%
Region 1		807	43.8%	782	39.4%	840	39.2%		Putnam	62	37.6%	71	44.4%	64	36.6%	Wilson	45	39.5%	50	43.5%	63	48.1%	
2	Anderson	56	30.8%	52	33.1%	60	36.1%		Rhea	9	*	18	*	<5	*	Region 5		930	50.5%	827	48.8%	896	45.9%
	Blount	115	35.6%	127	37.9%	129	34.7%		Sequatchie	9	*	7	*	6	*	6	Benton	9	*	10	*	13	*
	Campbell	9	*	18	*	13	*		Smith	<5	*	7	*	<5	*		Carroll	27	43.5%	29	50.9%	27	50.0%
	Claiborne	7	*	9	*	7	*	Van Buren	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Chester		19	*	31	50.8%	22	41.5%	
	Cocke	13	*	30	44.8%	27	36.0%	Warren	26	28.9%	28	29.8%	41	37.3%	Crockett		46	75.4%	26	57.8%	22	45.8%	
	Grainger	7	*	17	*	10	*	White	20	26.3%	28	42.4%	11	*	Decatur		19	*	19	*	12	*	
	Hamblen	79	30.4%	85	48.6%	71	43.8%	Region 3		740	41.1%	713	38.2%	650	34.5%		Dyer	61	58.7%	52	56.5%	32	41.0%
	Jefferson	18	*	26	44.8%	34	37.0%	Region 4 (Davidson)		757	49.7%	841	50.0%	817	45.1%		Fayette	22	45.8%	33	58.9%	16	*
	Knox	481	40.3%	412	38.3%	369	36.4%	5	Bedford	38	49.4%	17	*	24	49.0%		Gibson	114	62.3%	121	54.8%	108	47.4%
	Loudon	18	*	17	*	17	*		Cannon	16	*	9	*	10	*		Hardeman	26	60.5%	30	61.2%	28	50.9%
	Monroe	22	31.4%	8	*	24	38.1%		Cheatham	24	53.3%	13	*	28	45.9%		Hardin	29	39.7%	27	39.7%	28	40.6%
	Morgan	5	*	7	*	6	*		Coffee	107	60.8%	77	48.7%	107	53.5%		Haywood	33	67.3%	25	65.8%	14	*
	Roane	18	*	19	*	25	32.9%		Dickson	30	51.7%	30	50.8%	25	35.2%		Henderson	42	53.8%	39	45.3%	40	40.8%
	Scott	8	*	9	*	3	*		Franklin	32	47.1%	22	41.5%	27	36.5%		Henry	19	*	22	44.0%	33	52.4%
	Sevier	68	39.5%	56	34.8%	34	30.4%		Giles	15	*	12	*	11	*		Lake	7	*	<5	*	6	*
	Union	12	*	11	*	9	*		Hickman	12	*	14	*	11	*		Lauderdale	52	53.1%	56	55.4%	39	52.7%
Region 2		936	33.8%	903	35.8%	838	34.2%		Houston	<5	*	<5	*	6	*		Madison	250	57.3%	223	54.9%	209	51.7%
3	Bledsoe	5	*	<5	*	<5	*		Humphreys	8	*	9	*	9	*	McNairy	34	55.7%	19	*	22	56.4%	
	Bradley	42	57.5%	49	45.4%	40	37.0%		Lawrence	18	*	12	*	23	33.3%	Obion	42	48.8%	34	47.2%	21	40.4%	
	Clay	17	*	20	46.5%	14	*		Lewis	13	*	13	*	9	*	Tipton	36	57.1%	35	44.3%	48	53.9%	
	Cumberland	31	33.0%	25	34.2%	32	40.0%		Lincoln	10	*	12	*	20	44.4%	Weakley	27	49.1%	14	*	17	*	
	DeKalb	22	31.4%	23	22.3%	20	26.0%		Marshall	16	*	12	*	15	*	Region 6		914	54.1%	849	51.7%	757	47.3%
	Fentress	18	*	9	*	8	*		Mauzy	78	44.1%	60	51.3%	69	46.0%	Region 7 (Shelby)		1,127	54.6%	1,084	53.0%	1,086	50.9%
	Grundy	<5	*	9	*	5	*		Montgomery	90	59.2%	75	53.2%	55	44.4%	County unknown		2	*	5	*	10	*
	Hamilton	381	49.2%	345	42.6%	333	41.4%	Moore	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	Tennessee		6,213	45.9%	6,004	44.7%	5,894	42.1%	

Top 25% **Bottom 25%**

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Chart 24. Admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse

**significant increase or decrease
compared to previous fiscal year.*





Figure 4. Admissions to TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse: FY2016




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Rates for counties not reported for events <20. Significance calculated by using z-score test for two population proportions.

Table 27. Admissions with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse: gender

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Female						Male					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	311	40.7%	301	38.0%	333	42.4%	454	59.3%	491	62.0%	453	57.6%
Region 2	312	33.9%	301	35.7%	261	29.7%	607	66.1%	542	64.3%	617	70.3%
Region 3	191	29.9%	216	35.0%	183	28.0%	448	70.1%	401	65.0%	470	72.0%
Region 4	193	29.7%	213	29.3%	250	32.1%	457	70.3%	514	70.7%	528	67.9%
Region 5	200	25.9%	172	24.1%	196	26.7%	571	74.1%	542	75.9%	539	73.3%
Region 6	187	24.9%	152	22.2%	191	26.8%	563	75.1%	532	77.8%	522	73.2%
Region 7	202	23.4%	182	22.0%	195	25.0%	661	76.6%	644	78.0%	586	75.0%
N/A	<5	*	<5	*	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
Tennessee	1,597	29.8%	1,538	29.5%	1,609	30.2%	3,764	70.2%	3,668	70.5%	3,718	69.8%

Chart 25. Admissions with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse: Regional gender percentages in FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for transgender individuals are not included (n=1 for FY14). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable;


*Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 28. Admissions with MARIJUANA identified as a substance of abuse: age groups

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Age 12-17						Age 18-24						Age 25+					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	261	34.1%	249	31.4%	217	27.6%	119	15.6%	99	12.5%	109	13.9%	385	50.3%	444	56.1%	460	58.5%
Region 2	115	12.5%	65	7.7%	119	13.6%	235	25.6%	192	22.8%	150	17.1%	569	61.9%	586	69.5%	609	69.4%
Region 3	53	8.3%	<5	*	28	4.3%	147	23.0%	117	19.0%	104	15.9%	439	68.7%	497	80.6%	521	79.8%
Region 4	114	17.5%	99	13.7%	90	11.6%	107	16.5%	128	17.7%	135	17.4%	429	66.0%	496	68.6%	553	71.1%
Region 5	116	15.1%	39	5.5%	32	4.4%	195	25.3%	170	23.8%	169	23.0%	459	59.6%	505	70.7%	533	72.6%
Region 6	87	11.6%	44	6.4%	68	9.5%	155	20.7%	135	19.7%	121	17.0%	508	67.7%	505	73.8%	524	73.5%
Region 7	32	3.7%	10	*	25	3.2%	202	23.4%	140	17.0%	145	18.6%	629	72.9%	674	81.8%	609	78.2%
N/A	0	*	0	*	0	*		*	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
Tennessee	778	14.5%	509	9.8%	579	10.9%	1,160	21.6%	981	18.9%	934	17.5%	3,422	63.8%	3,710	71.3%	3,811	71.6%

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Chart 26. Admissions with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse: Regional age group percentages in FY2016




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for individuals with unknown age are not included (n=1 for FY14, n=6 for FY15, and n=3 for FY16). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 29. Admissions with MARIJUANA identified as a substance of abuse: race

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Black or African American						White					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	40	5.2%	45	5.7%	40	5.1%	697	91.3%	727	91.8%	724	92.2%
Region 2	91	9.9%	103	12.2%	97	11.1%	811	88.3%	718	85.2%	757	86.3%
Region 3	122	19.1%	102	16.6%	105	16.3%	500	78.2%	503	81.7%	532	82.5%
Region 4	361	56.1%	401	55.4%	460	59.4%	237	36.8%	280	38.7%	272	35.1%
Region 5	151	19.6%	128	17.9%	155	21.1%	588	76.5%	572	80.1%	558	76.0%
Region 6	252	33.6%	207	30.3%	198	27.8%	485	64.7%	466	68.1%	497	69.9%
Region 7	625	72.5%	579	70.1%	517	66.3%	226	26.2%	236	28.6%	247	31.7%
N/A	<5	*	<5	*	0	*	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
Tennessee	1,645	30.8%	1,566	30.1%	1,572	29.6%	3,545	66.3%	3,504	67.4%	3,590	67.6%

Chart 27. Admissions with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse: Regional race percentages in FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: Admissions for individuals with unknown race are not included (n=13 for FY14, n=4 for FY15, and n=18 for FY16). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 30. Number and percentages of admissions with MARIJUANA as a substance of abuse

PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	40	40.0%	43	35.0%	52	28.0%
	Greene	99	40.9%	101	44.3%	98	39.8%
	Hancock	7	*	<5	*	8	*
	Hawkins	30	22.4%	64	35.6%	50	32.1%
	Johnson	29	53.7%	16	*	16	*
	Sullivan	284	42.5%	276	40.8%	281	38.6%
	Unicoi	6	*	15	*	24	49.0%
	Washington	270	45.5%	276	39.5%	257	35.4%
Region 1		765	41.5%	792	39.9%	786	36.6%
2	Anderson	45	24.7%	43	27.4%	44	26.5%
	Blount	91	28.2%	128	38.2%	141	37.9%
	Campbell	28	25.7%	43	35.8%	35	32.7%
	Claiborne	12	*	23	37.1%	11	*
	Cocke	16	*	25	37.3%	39	52.0%
	Grainger	16	*	15	*	16	*
	Hamblen	101	38.8%	74	42.3%	75	46.3%
	Jefferson	17	*	19	*	36	39.1%
	Knox	426	35.6%	371	34.4%	361	35.6%
	Loudon	18	*	8	*	18	*
	Monroe	36	51.4%	10	*	22	34.9%
	Morgan	9	*	11	*	11	*
	Roane	20	31.3%	10	*	23	30.3%
	Scott	8	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Sevier	60	34.9%	46	28.6%	32	28.6%
	Union	16	*	14	*	10	*
Region 2		919	33.2%	843	33.4%	878	35.8%
3	Bledsoe	<5	*	<5	*	3	*
	Bradley	36	49.3%	44	40.7%	45	41.7%
	Clay	15	*	15	*	16	*
	Cumberland	24	25.5%	12	*	14	*
	DeKalb	26	37.1%	32	31.1%	29	37.7%
	Fentress	11	*	7	*	11	*
	Grundy	10	*	8	*	<5	*
	Hamilton	305	39.4%	319	39.4%	311	38.6%
	Region 3	639	35.5%	617	33.0%	653	34.6%
3	Jackson	8	*	9	*	20	35.1%
	Macon	13	*	7	*	7	*
	Marion	22	44.9%	13	*	13	*
	McMinn	19	*	25	32.9%	20	35.1%
	Meigs	<5	*	3	*	2	*
	Overton	11	*	<5	*	7	*
	Pickett	<5	*	0	*	0	*
	Polk	6	*	6	*	6	*
	Putnam	43	26.1%	25	15.6%	59	33.7%
	Rhea	9	*	14	*	11	*
	Sequatchie	<5	*	5	*	<5	*
	Smith	11	*	6	*	10	*
	Van Buren	6	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Warren	30	33.3%	42	44.7%	41	37.3%
	White	23	30.3%	17	*	22	36.1%
Region 4 (Davidson)		651	42.7%	727	43.2%	778	43.0%
5	Bedford	47	61.0%	14	*	28	57.1%
	Cannon	12	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Cheatham	15	33.3%	9	*	21	34.4%
	Coffee	102	58.0%	84	53.2%	96	48.0%
	Dickson	17	*	19	*	23	32.4%
	Franklin	31	45.6%	28	52.8%	23	31.1%
	Giles	9	*	16	*	13	*
	Hickman	8	*	14	*	6	*
	Houston	1	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Humphreys	5	*	10	*	<5	*
	Lawrence	32	48.5%	20	43.5%	27	39.1%
	Lewis	11	*	11	*	10	*
	Lincoln	9	*	11	*	27	60.0%
	Marshall	12	*	9	*	12	*
	Maury	100	56.5%	52	44.4%	64	42.7%
	Montgomery	61	40.1%	74	52.5%	53	42.7%
	Moore	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
Region 5		771	41.9%	714	42.2%	735	37.6%
5	Perry	<5	*	5	*	12	*
	Robertson	17	*	24	34.3%	26	26.0%
	Rutherford	149	42.6%	166	47.3%	115	38.6%
	Stewart	<5	*	6	*	7	*
	Sumner	62	32.8%	68	35.8%	79	30.4%
	Trousdale	0	*	<5	*	6	*
	Wayne	8	v	6	*	<5	*
	Williamson	20	23.8%	28	30.8%	32	36.8%
	Wilson	36	31.6%	32	27.8%	41	31.3%
Region 6		750	44.4%	826	40.4%	713	44.5%
6	Benton	13	*	11	*	19	*
	Carroll	35	56.5%	21	36.8%	26	48.1%
	Chester	11	*	20	32.8%	24	45.3%
	Crockett	34	55.7%	20	44.4%	21	43.8%
	Decatur	15	*	19	*	13	*
	Dyer	54	51.9%	42	45.7%	41	52.6%
	Fayette	15	*	19	*	22	51.2%
	Gibson	77	42.1%	90	40.7%	123	53.9%
	Hardeman	23	53.5%	24	49.0%	26	47.3%
	Hardin	22	30.1%	24	35.3%	25	36.2%
	Haywood	18	*	14	*	22	64.7%
	Henderson	30	38.5%	32	37.2%	41	41.8%
	Henry	40	56.3%	19	*	24	38.1%
	Lake	13	*	9	*	8	*
	Lauderdale	56	57.1%	61	60.4%	41	55.4%
	Madison	196	45.0%	165	40.6%	162	40.1%
	McNairy	16	*	14	*	10	*
	Obion	44	51.2%	41	56.9%	23	44.2%
	Tipton	18	*	28	35.4%	31	34.8%
	Weakley	20	36.4%	11	*	11	*
Region 7 (Shelby)		863	41.8%	903	41.7%	781	36.6%
County unknown		<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
Tennessee		5,362	39.6%	5,206	38.7%	5,327	38.0%

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

2.4. TDMHSAS-funded substance abuse treatment services: other substances of abuse by county and region

Cocaine/Crack
Methamphetamine/stimulants
Heroin
Other illicit drugs¹
Other prescription drugs²

¹ Please note that "Other illicit drugs" include LSD, non-Prescription Methadone, other hallucinogens, aerosols, PCP or PCP combination, solvents, ketamine (Special K), diphenhydramine, nitrites and other over-the-counter drugs, inhalants or unknown drugs.

² Please note that "Other prescription drugs" include clonazepam, alprazolam, diazepam, lorazepam, other barbiturate sedatives and tranquilizers, ethchlorvynol, chlordiazepoxide, barbiturates, clorazepate, triazolam, flunitrazepam and other non-barbiturate sedatives and benzodiazepines.

Table 31. Number and percentages of admissions with COCAINE or CRACK as a substance of abuse

PPR	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		Top 25%	Bottom 25%
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Region 1	203	11.0%	229	11.5%	225	10.5%		
Region 2	326	11.8%	296	11.7%	247	10.1%		
Region 3	224	12.4%	206	11.0%	182	9.7%		
Region 4 (Davidson)	569	37.3%	610	36.3%	672	37.1%		
Region 5	359	19.5%	300	17.7%	350	17.9%		
Region 6	340	20.1%	328	20.0%	274	17.1%		
Region 7 (Shelby)	699	33.9%	663	32.4%	662	31.0%		
Tennessee	2,722	20.1%	2,634	19.6%	2,614	18.7%		

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Table 32. Number and percentages of admissions with METHAMPHETAMINES and STIMULANTS as a substance of abuse

PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	14	*	19	*	53	28.5%
	Greene	33	13.6%	43	18.9%	83	33.7%
	Hancock	<5	*	7	*	8	*
	Hawkins	24	17.9%	25	13.9%	34	21.8%
	Johnson	19	*	5	*	12	*
	Sullivan	54	8.1%	99	14.6%	104	14.3%
	Unicoi	6	*	3	*	8	*
	Washington	52	8.8%	89	12.7%	166	22.8%
Region 1		205	11.1%	290	14.6%	468	21.8%
2	Anderson	30	16.5%	30	19.1%	47	28.3%
	Blount	21	6.5%	18	*	31	8.3%
	Campbell	25	22.9%	33	27.5%	41	38.3%
	Claiborne	20	36.4%	11	*	9	*
	Cocke	<5	*	5	*	18	*
	Grainger	10	*	15	*	17	*
	Hamblen	40	15.4%	33	18.9%	51	31.5%
	Jefferson	7	*	8	*	20	21.7%
	Knox	87	7.3%	71	6.6%	122	12.0%
	Loudon	9	*	<5	*	7	*
	Monroe	36	51.4%	18	*	20	31.7%
	Morgan	7	*	19	*	20	44.4%
	Roane	15	23.4%	10	*	22	28.9%
	Scott	8	*	<5	*	6	*
	Sevier	20	11.6%	15	*	23	20.5%
	Union	<5	*	6	*	3	*
Region 2		340	12.3%	300	11.9%	457	18.6%
3	Bledsoe	4	*	6	*	9	*
	Bradley	23	31.5%	41	38.0%	52	48.1%
	Clay	<5	*	9	*	11	*
	Cumberland	31	33.0%	20	27.4%	34	42.5%
	DeKalb	15	*	31	30.1%	31	40.3%
	Fentress	22	38.6%	16	*	14	*
	Grundy	12	*	14	*	8	*
	Hamilton	179	23.1%	243	30.0%	290	36.0%
PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
3	Jackson	6	*	<5	*	9	*
	Macon	11	*	5	*	12	*
	Marion	16	*	17	*	15	*
	McMinn	17	*	32	42.1%	34	59.6%
	Meigs	8	*	6	*	9	*
	Overton	<5	*	5	*	13	*
	Pickett	<5	*	0	*	<5	*
	Polk	6	*	<5	*	6	*
	Putnam	32	19.4%	38	23.8%	54	30.9%
	Rhea	17	*	17	*	25	64.1%
	Sequatchie	6	*	9	*	15	*
	Smith	5	*	5	*	12	*
	Van Buren	5	*	5	*	5	*
	Warren	40	44.4%	50	53.2%	47	42.7%
	White	27	35.5%	24	36.4%	33	54.1%
Region 3		489	27.2%	597	32.0%	739	39.2%
Region 4 (Davidson)		70	4.6%	100	5.9%	114	6.3%
5	Bedford	8	*	9	*	10	*
	Cannon	9	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Cheatham	<5	*	5	*	12	*
	Coffee	28	15.9%	47	29.7%	67	33.5%
	Dickson	8	*	11	*	21	29.6%
	Franklin	13	*	14	*	30	40.5%
	Giles	<5	*	8	*	8	*
	Hickman	<5	*	6	*	10	*
	Houston	0	*	0	*	<5	*
	Humphreys	<5	*	10	*	7	*
	Lawrence	27	40.9%	17	*	23	33.3%
	Lewis	21	55.3%	23	63.9%	19	*
	Lincoln	5	*	3	*	16	*
	Marshall	<5	*	5	*	2	*
	Mauzy	16	*	25	21.4%	33	22.0%
	Montgomery	18	*	24	17.0%	21	16.9%
	Moore	<5	*	0	*	<5	33.3%
PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
5	Perry	<5	*	5	*	6	*
	Robertson	<5	*	<5	*	7	*
	Rutherford	22	6.3%	18	*	31	10.4%
	Stewart	<5	*	5	*	9	*
	Sumner	14	*	19	*	40	15.4%
	Trousdale	0	*	<5	*	<5	*
	Wayne	12	*	10	*	9	*
	Williamson	8	*	12	*	13	*
	Wilson	7	*	18	*	10	*
Region 5		238	12.9%	302	17.8%	415	21.2%
6	Benton	19	*	9	*	25	59.5%
	Carroll	20	32.3%	20	35.1%	26	48.1%
	Chester	<5	*	6	*	14	*
	Crockett	7	*	9	*	13	*
	Decatur	8	*	<5	*	8	*
	Dyer	25	24.0%	21	22.8%	24	30.8%
	Fayette	8	*	10	*	10	*
	Gibson	51	27.9%	42	19.0%	68	29.8%
	Hardeman	12	*	9	*	20	36.4%
	Hardin	35	47.9%	29	42.6%	44	63.8%
	Haywood	11	*	5	*	9	*
	Henderson	22	28.2%	28	32.6%	47	48.0%
	Henry	24	33.8%	17	*	16	*
	Lake	<5	*	6	*	<5	*
	Lauderdale	35	35.7%	31	30.7%	22	29.7%
	Madison	46	10.6%	63	15.5%	72	17.8%
	McNairy	16	*	19	*	14	*
	Obion	41	47.7%	26	36.1%	23	44.2%
	Tipton	14	*	19	*	21	23.6%
	Weakley	22	40.0%	15	*	17	*
Region 6		424	25.1%	388	23.6%	497	31.0%
Region 7 (Shelby)		83	4.0%	112	5.5%	177	8.3%
County unknown		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	<5	*
Tennessee		1,849	13.7%	2,089	15.5%	2,869	20.5%

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Table 33. Number and percentages of admissions with HEROIN as a substance of abuse

PPR	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		Top 25%	Bottom 25%
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Region 1	28	1.5%	47	2.4%	58	2.7%		
Region 2	97	3.5%	150	5.9%	230	9.4%		
Region 3	72	4.0%	106	5.7%	142	7.5%		
Region 4 (Davidson)	106	7.0%	169	10.0%	253	14.0%		
Region 5	82	4.5%	121	7.1%	163	8.3%		
Region 6	52	3.1%	87	5.3%	138	8.6%		
Region 7 (Shelby)	284	13.8%	386	18.9%	528	24.7%		
Tennessee	721	5.3%	1,069	8.0%	1,518	10.8%		

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Table 34. Number and percentages of admissions with OTHER PRESCRIPTION DRUGS as a substance of

PPR	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		Top 25%	Bottom 25%
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Region 1	368	20.0%	419	21.1%	526	24.5%		
Region 2	689	24.9%	604	23.9%	519	21.2%		
Region 3	381	21.2%	398	21.3%	394	20.9%		
Region 4 (Davidson)	126	8.3%	165	9.8%	158	8.7%		
Region 5	295	16.0%	302	17.8%	322	16.5%		
Region 6	242	14.3%	243	14.8%	165	7.7%		
Region 7 (Shelby)	96	4.7%	141	6.9%	147	7.1%		
Tennessee	2,198	16.2%	2,275	16.9%	2,301	16.4%		

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Table 35. Number and percentages of admissions with OTHER ILLICIT DRUGS as a

PPR	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		Top 25%	Bottom 25%
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Region 1	118	6.4%	120	6.0%	96	4.5%		
Region 2	42	1.5%	27	1.1%	26	1.1%		
Region 3	28	1.6%	31	1.7%	20	1.1%		
Region 4 (Davidson)	48	3.1%	56	3.3%	30	1.7%		
Region 5	32	1.7%	19	*	11	*		
Region 6	20	1.2%	15	*	16	*		
Region 7 (Shelby)	12	*	13	*	8	*		
Tennessee	300	2.2%	281	2.1%	208	1.5%		

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to substance abuse treatment services - Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region


2.5. Recovery courts

Table 36. TDMHSAS-funded recovery courts: new admissions in FY2016*

TDMHSAS Region	Number of new admissions in FY2016
Region 1	60
Region 2	278
Region 3	231
Region 4	265
Region 5	284
Region 6	213
Region 7	351
Tennessee	1,682

*New admissions to recovery courts in **FY2016** (from 07/01/2015 to 06/30/2016) do not represent the total number of individuals served.*

Chart 28. New admissions to recovery courts* per 100,000 population: FY2016



Data source: Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS), Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services.

*Please note that the number of admissions includes all recovery courts (adult and juvenile recovery courts)

SECTION 3:


TDMHSAS-funded MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

3.1. Regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS

Table 37. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to psychiatric hospitals

	FY2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
Regional mental health institutes	8,115	9,218	9,737	9,309
Private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS	2,676	2,882	2,975	3,007
Statewide number of admissions	10,791	12,100	12,712	12,316

Chart 29. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS




Data source: TDMHSAS Division of Hospital Services. Patients age 18 and older were included.

Please note that Lakeshore Mental Health Institute closed with the end of FY2012; TDMHSAS started contracting with private psychiatric hospitals in FY2012.

Table 38. TDMHSAS-funded admissions to regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS

TDMHSAS Region	Tennessee	PPR 1	PPR 2	PPR 3	PPR 4	PPR 5	PPR 6	PPR 7	N/A*
FY14	12,100	1,299	2,100	1,972	1,706	2,082	828	1,523	590
	100%	10.74%	17.36%	16.30%	14.10%	17.21%	6.84%	12.59%	4.88%
FY15	12,712	1,435	2,188	2,220	1,742	2,144	859	1,480	644
	100%	11.29%	17.21%	17.46%	13.70%	16.87%	6.76%	11.64%	5.07%
FY16	12,316	1,418	2,080	1,922	1,778	2,145	833	1,485	655
	100%	11.51%	16.89%	15.61%	14.44%	17.42%	6.76%	12.06%	5.32%

Chart 30. TDMHSAS funded admissions to regional mental health institutes/private psychiatric hospitals per 1,000 population 18+ years




Data source: TDMHSAS Division of Hospital Services.

*Data note: N/A includes admission from out of state as well as admissions with missing county of residence; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region.

Table 39. Admissions by region and gender

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Female						Male					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	462	35.6%	476	35.3%	388	27.4%	837	64.4%	873	64.7%	1030	72.6%
Region 2	796	37.9%	741	36.6%	699	33.6%	1304	62.1%	1,285	63.4%	1381	66.4%
Region 3	760	38.5%	856	41.8%	711	37.0%	1212	61.5%	1,193	58.2%	1211	63.0%
Region 4	572	33.5%	529	30.9%	541	30.5%	1134	66.5%	1,184	69.1%	1234	69.5%
Region 5	826	39.7%	814	39.2%	770	35.9%	1255	60.3%	1,261	60.8%	1374	64.1%
Region 6	273	33.0%	307	36.4%	291	34.9%	555	67.0%	536	63.6%	542	65.1%
Region 7	530	34.8%	484	32.9%	479	32.3%	993	65.2%	988	67.1%	1006	67.7%
N/A	235	39.8%	245	42.2%	254	38.8%	355	60.2%	335	57.8%	401	61.2%
Tennessee	4,454	36.8%	4,452	36.8%	4,133	33.6%	7,645	63.2%	7,655	63.2%	8,179	66.4%

Chart 31. Gender percentages among admissions by region: FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.


Data note: Data excludes admissions with missing gender (n=1 for FY14, n=2 for FY15 and n=4 for FY16).

Table 40. Admissions by region and age group

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy	Age 18-25						Age 26+					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	#	%	#	%	n	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	230	18.1%	242	17.2%	205	14.5%	1040	81.9%	1161	82.8%	1206	85.5%
Region 2	310	14.9%	285	13.1%	281	13.6%	1773	85.1%	1885	86.9%	1780	86.4%
Region 3	320	16.3%	339	15.3%	307	16.0%	1644	83.7%	1877	84.7%	1614	84.0%
Region 4	288	16.9%	277	15.9%	246	13.8%	1416	83.1%	1463	84.1%	1532	86.2%
Region 5	399	19.2%	406	19.0%	396	18.5%	1679	80.8%	1736	81.0%	1749	81.5%
Region 6	140	16.9%	133	15.5%	140	16.8%	687	83.1%	726	84.5%	693	83.2%
Region 7	306	20.1%	284	19.2%	272	18.3%	1216	79.9%	1196	80.8%	1213	81.7%
N/A	93	16.0%	124	19.5%	134	20.6%	490	84.0%	511	80.5%	515	79.4%
Tennessee	2,086	17.3%	2,090	16.5%	1,981	16.1%	9,945	82.7%	10,555	83.5%	10,302	83.9%

Chart 32. Age group percentages among admissions by region: FY2016

Top 25% Bottom 25%




Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.

Data note: Data excludes admissions from individuals under 18 years (n=69 for FY14, n=66 for FY15 and n=32 for FY16) as well as admissions with unknown age (n=1 for FY15 and n=1 for FY16).

Table 41. Admissions by region and race

TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Black or African American						White					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Region 1	23	1.8%	21	1.5%	13	0.9%	1268	97.6%	1411	98.3%	1402	98.9%
Region 2	163	7.8%	169	7.7%	190	9.1%	1926	91.8%	1998	91.4%	1868	89.9%
Region 3	412	20.9%	410	18.5%	344	17.9%	1527	77.4%	1765	79.6%	1537	80.1%
Region 4	568	33.3%	608	34.9%	646	36.3%	1058	62.0%	1031	59.2%	1031	58.0%
Region 5	268	12.9%	311	14.5%	279	13.0%	1739	83.5%	1775	82.8%	1775	82.8%
Region 6	273	33.0%	288	33.6%	231	27.7%	540	65.2%	556	64.8%	577	69.3%
Region 7	1113	73.1%	1062	72.5%	1086	73.4%	362	23.8%	344	23.5%	342	23.1%
N/A	98	16.6%	120	18.7%	136	20.8%	478	81.2%	510	79.4%	501	76.7%
Tennessee	2,918	24.1%	2,989	23.6%	2,925	23.8%	8,898	73.5%	9,390	74.0%	9,033	73.4%

Chart 33. Race percentages among admissions by region: FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.


Data note: Data excludes admissions with unknown race (n=2 for FY14, n=22 for FY15 and n=13 for FY16). Data for admissions for individuals with "Other" race (n=284 for FY14, n=333 for FY15, n=358 for FY16) are not shown in Table 47.

Table 42. Admissions by region and ethnicity


TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region	Hispanic or Latino					
	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Region 1	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*
Region 2	5	*	8	*	7	*
Region 3	29	*	28	1.4%	24	1.4%
Region 4	39	2.3%	59	3.5%	50	2.9%
Region 5	56	2.7%	34	1.6%	54	2.7%
Region 6	6	*	6	*	12	*
Region 7	34	2.3%	33	2.3%	35	2.4%
N/A	6	*	7	*	10	*
Tennessee	177	1.7%	178	1.6%	194	1.8%

*Please note that race
and ethnicity are
collected separately.*

**Chart 34: Percentage of Hispanic and Latino individuals
living in poverty in Tennessee (American Community Survey,
2015)**



**Chart 35. Percentage of Hispanic and Latino individuals served in RMHI and
private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: FY2016**



Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.

Data note: Data excludes admissions for individuals with unknown ethnicity (N=1,765 for FY14, N=1,775 for FY15, and N=1,579 for FY16). <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20.

Table 43. Number of admissions and rate per 1,000 population 18+ years by Planning and Policy Regions and counties

PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016					
		#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate		
1	Carter	141	3.1	128	2.8	154	3.4	3	Jackson	11	*	10	*	10	*	5	Perry	18	*	11	*	12	*				
	Greene	126	2.3	147	2.7	167	3.0		Macon	29	1.7	29	1.7	26	1.5		Robertson	66	1.3	55	1.1	59	1.1				
	Hancock	12	*	17	*	16	*		Marion	67	3.0	49	2.2	66	2.9		Rutherford	357	1.6	388	1.7	407	1.8				
	Hawkins	92	2.1	125	2.8	72	1.6		McMinn	105	2.5	140	3.4	117	2.8		Stewart	16	1.5	12	*	16	*				
	Johnson	47	3.2	35	2.4	29	2.0		Meigs	31	3.3	30	3.2	29	3.1		Sumner	221	1.7	217	1.6	209	1.6				
	Sullivan	352	2.8	289	3.1	394	3.1		Overton	11	*	18	*	26	1.5		Trousdale	21	3.4	15	*	15	*				
	Unicoi	52	3.6	47	3.2	50	3.5		Pickett	0	*	<5	*	<5	*		Wayne	22	1.6	26	1.9	29	2.1				
	Washington	448	4.4	516	5.1	530	5.2		Polk	44	3.3	49	3.7	36	2.7		Williamson	95	0.6	113	0.7	90	0.6				
Region 1		1,270	3.1	1,404	3.4	1,412	3.5		Putnam	105	1.8	136	2.3	140	2.4		Wilson	125	1.3	139	1.4	162	1.7				
2	Anderson	203	3.2	215	3.6	222	3.7	4	Rhea	103	4.1	108	4.3	78	3.1	Region 5						2,078	1.7	2,142	1.7	2,145	1.7
	Blount	189	1.2	171	1.7	124	1.2		Sequatchie	20	1.7	46	4.0	33	2.9	6	Benton	28	2.2	42	3.3	34	2.6				
	Campbell	96	3.4	123	3.9	93	3.0		Smith	15	*	23	1.6	23	1.6		Carroll	60	2.7	45	2.1	49	2.2				
	Claiborne	50	1.0	63	2.5	63	2.5		Van Buren	14	*	11	*	5	*		Chester	10	0.7	22	1.6	12	*				
	Cocke	43	1.7	58	2.1	45	1.6		Warren	68	2.2	88	2.9	91	3.0		Crockett	11	*	9	*	9	*				
	Grainger	31	1.2	26	1.4	36	2.0		White	21	1.0	29	1.4	36	1.7		Decatur	13	*	23	2.5	12	*				
	Hamblen	73	1.7	94	1.9	90	1.9		Region 3		1,964	2.6	2,216	2.9	1,921		2.5	Dyer	53	1.8	56	1.9	54	1.9			
	Jefferson	60	1.7	58	1.4	60	1.4		Region 4 (Davidson)		1,704	3.2	1,740	3.3	1,778		3.3	Fayette	25	0.8	30	1.0	39	1.3			
	Knox	853	1.9	860	2.4	841	2.4	5	Bedford	78	2.2	90	2.6	80	2.3		Gibson	46	1.2	52	1.4	48	1.3				
	Loudon	65	1.5	53	1.3	66	1.6		Cannon	34	3.1	19	1.7	27	2.5	Hardeman	111	5.4	112	5.4	130	6.3					
	Monroe	73	1.4	82	2.3	78	2.2		Cheatham	45	1.5	45	1.5	54	1.8	Hardin	31	1.5	36	1.8	43	2.1					
	Morgan	47	2.0	49	2.8	51	3.0		Coffee	126	3.1	127	3.1	97	2.4	Haywood	23	1.7	15	1.1	22	1.6					
	Roane	128	3.5	149	3.5	134	3.2		Dickson	87	2.2	86	2.2	100	2.5	Henderson	40	1.9	35	1.6	25	1.2					
	Scott	37	2.2	38	2.3	29	1.8		Franklin	71	2.2	73	2.2	79	2.4	Henry	26	1.0	30	1.2	24	0.9					
	Sevier	113	1.4	114	1.5	113	1.5		Giles	67	2.9	58	2.5	88	3.9	Lake	8	*	<5	*	<5	*					
	Union	22	1.4	17	*	16	*		Hickman	40	2.1	70	3.7	41	2.1	Lauderdale	30	1.4	38	1.8	55	2.6					
Region 2		2,083	1.9	2,170	2.3	2,061	2.2	Houston	11	*	10	*	24	3.8	Madison	149	2.0	156	2.1	115	1.5						
3	Bledsoe	24	2.0	23	1.9	25	2.1	Humphreys	32	2.3	28	2.0	34	2.4	McNairy	53	2.6	42	2.1	42	2.1						
	Bradley	205	2.5	229	2.8	178	2.2	Lawrence	67	2.1	65	2.0	59	1.9	Obion	26	1.1	29	1.2	31	1.3						
	Clay	7	*	16	*	6	*	Lewis	43	4.6	29	3.1	26	2.8	Tipton	40	0.9	45	1.0	55	1.2						
	Cumberland	51	1.1	57	1.2	70	1.5	Lincoln	24	0.9	39	1.5	36	1.4	Weakley	44	1.6	39	1.4	30	1.1						
	DeKalb	39	2.6	48	3.2	23	1.5	Marshall	38	1.6	49	2.0	32	1.3	Region 6						827	1.7	859	1.8	833	1.7	
	Fentress	17	*	32	2.3	32	2.3	Maury	180	2.7	177	2.6	142	2.1	Region 7 (Shelby)						1,522	2.2	1,480	2.1	1,485	2.1	
	Grundy	38	3.6	45	4.3	37	3.5	Montgomery	193	1.4	198	1.4	225	1.6	N/A						583	-	635	-	649	-	
	Hamilton	939	3.4	997	3.6	830	3.0	Moore	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*	Tennessee						12,031	2.2	12,646	2.4	12,284	2.3	

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.

N/A includes admissions from individuals "out of state" or where the county of residence was unknown or not collected.

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region.


Top 25% Bottom 25%

In addition to presenting data for counties and regions by **TDMHSAS Planning and Policy regions**, the next page displays county and regional data by regional mental health institute (**RMHI**) regions. Note that allocations of counties in RMHI regions vary compared to TDMHSAS Planning and Policy regions!

Table 44. RMHI Regions and psychiatric hospitals operated by or under contract with TDMHSAS

Psychiatric hospital	RMHI Region served							Counties served:
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Woodridge	✓							Carter, Greene, Hancock, Hawkins, Johnson, Sullivan, Unicoi, Washington.
Peninsula		✓						Anderson, Blount, Campbell, Claiborne, Cocke, Grainger, Jefferson, Hamblen, Knox, Loudon, Monroe, Morgan, Roane, Scott, Sevier, Union.
Ridgeview		✓						
Moccasin Bend Mental Health Institute (MBMHI)	✓	✓	✓					Anderson, Bedford, Bledsoe, Blount, Bradley, Carter, Campbell, Claiborne, Clay, Cocke, Coffee, Cumberland, DeKalb, Fentress, Franklin, Grainger, Greene, Grundy, Hamblen, Hamilton, Hancock, Hawkins, Jackson, Jefferson, Johnson, Knox, Lincoln, Loudon, Macon, Marion, McMinn, Meigs, Moore, Monroe, Morgan, Overton, Pickett, Polk, Putnam, Rhea, Roane, Scott, Sesquatchie, Sevier, Sullivan, Smith, Unicoi, Union, VanBuren, Washington, Warren, White
Middle Tennessee Mental Health Institute (MTMHI)				✓	✓			Cannon, Cheatham, Davidson, Dickson, Giles, Hickman, Houston, Humphreys, Maury, Marshall, Montgomery, Roberston, Rutherford, Stewart, Sumner, Trousdale, Williamson, Wilson.
Western Mental Health Institute (WMHI)						✓		Benton, Carroll, Chester, Crockett, Decatur, Dyer, Fayette, Gibson, Hardeman, Hardin, Haywood, Henderson, Henry, Lake, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Lewis, Madison, McNairy, Obion, Perry, Tipton, Wayne, Weakley.
Memphis Mental Health Institute (MMHI)							✓	Shelby

Figure 5. Location of hospitals by RMHI regions 1 - 7



Data source: TDMHSAS Division of Hospital Services.

Table 44A. Number of admissions and rate per 1,000 population 18+ years by RMHI Regions and counties

RMHI Region	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		RMHI Region	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		RMHI Region	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
		#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate	#	Rate
1	Carter	141	3.1	128	2.8	154	3.4	3	Franklin	71	2.2	73	2.2	79	2.4	5	Stewart	16	*	12	*	16	*
	Greene	126	2.3	147	2.7	167	3.0		Grundy	38	3.6	45	4.3	37	3.5		Sumner	221	1.7	217	1.6	209	1.6
	Hancock	12	*	17	3.3	16	3.1		Hamilton	939	3.4	997	3.6	830	3.0		Trousdale	21	3.4	15	*	15	*
	Hawkins	92	2.1	125	2.8	72	1.6		Jackson	11	*	10	*	10	*		Williamson	95	0.6	113	0.7	90	0.6
	Johnson	47	3.2	35	2.4	29	2.0		Lincoln	24	0.9	39	1.5	36	1.4		Wilson	125	1.3	139	1.4	162	1.7
	Sullivan	352	2.8	389	3.1	394	3.1		Macon	29	1.7	29	1.7	26	1.5		RMHI Region 5		1628	1.5	1679	1.6	1725
	Unicoi	52	3.6	47	3.2	50	3.5		Marion	67	3.0	49	2.2	66	2.9	6	Benton	28	2.2	42	3.3	34	2.6
	Washington	448	4.4	516	5.1	530	5.2		McMinn	105	2.5	140	3.4	117	2.8		Carroll	60	2.7	45	2.1	49	2.2
RMHI Region 1		1270	3.1	1404	3.4	1412	3.5		Meigs	31	3.3	30	3.2	29	3.1		Chester	10	*	22	1.6	12	*
2	Anderson	203	3.4	215	3.6	222	3.7		Moore	<5	*	<5	*	<5	*		Crockett	11	*	9	*	9	*
	Blount	189	1.9	171	1.7	124	1.2		Overton	11	*	18	*	26	1.5		Decatur	13	*	23	2.5	12	*
	Campbell	96	3.1	123	3.9	93	3.0		Pickett	0	*	<5	*	<5	*		Dyer	53	1.8	56	1.9	54	1.9
	Claiborne	50	2.0	63	2.5	63	2.5		Polk	44	3.3	49	3.7	36	2.7		Fayette	25	0.8	30	1.0	39	1.3
	Cocke	43	1.5	58	2.1	45	1.6		Putnam	105	1.8	136	2.3	140	2.4		Gibson	46	1.2	52	1.4	48	1.3
	Grainger	31	1.7	26	1.4	36	2.0		Rhea	103	4.1	108	4.3	78	3.1		Hardeman	111	5.4	112	5.4	130	6.3
	Hamblen	73	1.5	94	1.9	90	1.9		Sequatchie	20	1.7	46	4.0	33	2.9		Hardin	31	1.5	36	1.8	43	2.1
	Jefferson	60	1.4	58	1.4	60	1.4		Smith	15	*	23	1.6	23	1.6		Haywood	23	1.7	15	*	22	1.6
	Knox	853	2.4	860	2.4	841	2.4		Van Buren	14	3.0	11	*	5	*		Henderson	40	1.9	35	1.6	25	1.2
	Loudon	65	1.6	53	1.3	66	1.6	Warren	68	2.2	88	2.9	91	3.0	Henry	26	1.0	30	1.2	24	0.9		
	Monroe	73	2.0	82	2.3	78	2.2	White	21	1.0	29	1.4	36	1.7	Lake	8	*	3	*	4	*		
	Morgan	47	2.7	49	2.8	51	3.0	RMHI Region 3		2264	2.5	2548	2.8	2215	2.4	Lauderdale	30	1.4	38	1.8	55	2.6	
	Roane	128	3.0	149	3.5	134	3.2	Region 4 (Davidson)		1704	3.2	1740	3.3	1778	3.3	Lawrence	67	2.1	65	2.0	59	1.9	
	Scott	37	2.2	38	2.3	29	1.8	5	Cannon	34	3.1	19	*	27	2.5	Lewis	43	4.6	29	3.1	26	2.8	
	Sevier	113	1.5	114	1.5	113	1.5		Cheatham	45	1.5	45	1.5	54	1.8	Madison	149	2.0	156	2.1	115	1.5	
	Union	22	1.5	17	*	16	*		Dickson	87	2.2	86	2.2	100	2.5	McNairy	53	2.6	42	2.1	42	2.1	
RMHI Region 2		2083	2.2	2170	2.3	2061	2.2		Giles	67	2.9	58	2.5	88	3.9	Obion	26	1.1	29	1.2	31	1.3	
3	Bedford	78	2.2	90	2.6	80	2.3		Hickman	40	2.1	70	3.7	41	2.1	Perry	18	*	11	*	12	*	
	Bledsoe	24	2.0	23	1.9	25	2.1		Houston	11	*	10	1.6	24	3.8	Tipton	40	0.9	45	1.0	55	1.2	
	Bradley	205	2.5	229	2.8	178	2.2		Humphreys	32	2.3	28	2.0	34	2.4	Wayne	22	1.6	26	1.9	29	2.1	
	Clay	7	*	16	2.6	6	*		Marshall	38	1.6	49	2.0	32	1.3	Weakley	44	1.6	39	1.4	30	1.1	
	Coffee	126	3.1	127	3.1	97	2.4		Maury	180	2.7	177	2.6	142	2.1	RMHI Region 6		977	1.8	990	1.8	959	1.7
	Cumberland	51	1.1	57	1.2	70	1.5		Montgomery	193	1.4	198	1.4	225	1.6	Region 7 (Shelby)		1522	2.2	1480	2.1	1485	2.1
	DeKalb	39	2.6	48	3.2	23	1.5		Robertson	66	1.3	55	1.1	59	1.1	N/A		583	-	635	-	649	-
	Fentress	17	*	32	2.3	32	2.3		Rutherford	357	1.6	388	1.7	407	1.8	Tennessee		12,031	2.2	12,646	2.4	12,284	2.3

Data source: TDMHSAS-funded admissions to mental health services in regional mental health institutes and private psychiatric hospitals that contract with TDMHSAS: Division of Hospital Services.

N/A includes admissions from individuals "out of state" or where the county of residence was unknown or not collected.

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for admissions <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region.

3.2. Behavioral Health Safety Net enrollees


Table 45. Behavioral Health Safety Net enrollees

TDMHSAS Region	Tennessee	Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4	Region 5	Region 6	Region 7
FY2014	34,668	3,321	9,014	4,567	3,378	7,115	4,142	3,131
	100%	9.58%	26.00%	13.17%	9.74%	20.52%	11.95%	9.03%
FY2015	32,410*	3,067	8,277	4,295	3,296	6,612	3,729	3,133
	100%	9.46%	25.54%	13.25%	10.17%	20.40%	11.51%	9.03%
FY2016	29,827*	2,827	7,32	4,222	3,191	5,991	3,259	3,015
	100%	9.48%	24.54%	14.15%	10.70%	20.09%	10.93%	10.11%

3.2. Behavioral Health Safety Net enrollees

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Chart 36. Rate of Behavioral Health Safety Net enrollees per 1,000 population living in poverty¹



Data source: TDMHSAS Behavioral Health Safety Net (BHSN) Database; U.S. Census Bureau, 2011-2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates (population 18+ living in poverty).

*Data note: Includes one out-of-state enrollee in FY2015 and two in FY2016.

¹Please note that Behavioral Health Safety Net eligibility criteria exclude individuals under 19 years of age. To calculate the 1,000 population rate, only numbers for individuals living in poverty ages 18 and above were available.

Table 46. Number of Behavioral Health Safety Net (BHSN) enrollments as a percentage of individuals living in poverty (18+)

PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016		PPR	County	FY2014		FY2015		FY2016	
		#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%			#	%	#	%	#	%
1	Carter	342	3.7%	277	3.0%	291	3.1%	3	Jackson	62	3.2%	57	3.0%	58	2.8%	5	Moore	10	*	5	*	9	*
	Greene	754	7.4%	667	6.5%	531	5.5%		Macon	101	3.0%	88	2.6%	88	2.8%		Perry	25	2.0%	19	*	15	*
	Hancock	79	5.9%	59	4.4%	56	4.2%		Marion	149	3.9%	139	3.7%	134	3.7%		Robertson	298	5.6%	279	5.2%	243	4.5%
	Hawkins	366	5.5%	318	4.8%	303	4.1%		McMinn	303	4.6%	288	4.3%	263	3.6%		Rutherford	890	3.4%	840	3.2%	748	2.9%
	Johnson	89	2.8%	80	2.5%	72	2.0%		Meigs	70	3.7%	74	3.9%	61	3.4%		Stewart	22	1.2%	22	1.2%	19	*
	Sullivan	963	5.0%	916	4.8%	900	4.8%		Overton	95	2.9%	89	2.7%	84	2.6%		Sumner	759	6.7%	587	5.2%	508	4.6%
	Unicoi	82	3.1%	76	2.9%	69	2.4%		Pickett	10	*	9	*	5	*		Trousdale	56	6.2%	47	5.2%	40	4.0%
	Washington	646	3.9%	674	4.0%	605	3.6%		Polk	45	2.0%	47	2.1%	59	2.7%		Wayne	83	3.3%	54	2.1%	57	2.2%
2	Anderson	406	4.9%	330	4.0%	345	4.0%		Putnam	450	3.4%	420	3.1%	410	3.0%	Williamson	164	2.2%	143	1.9%	154	2.2%	
	Blount	880	6.9%	768	6.0%	725	5.8%		Rhea	280	5.7%	232	4.7%	210	4.1%	Wilson	379	4.4%	341	4.0%	307	3.5%	
	Campbell	228	3.5%	214	3.3%	183	2.8%		Sequatchie	70	3.6%	72	3.7%	61	3.4%	Benton	124	4.9%	115	4.5%	111	4.1%	
	Claiborne	336	6.1%	294	5.4%	220	4.3%		Smith	60	2.8%	60	2.8%	47	2.2%	Carroll	179	4.4%	165	4.0%	147	3.5%	
	Cocke	487	7.3%	430	6.4%	365	5.8%		Van Buren	28	3.3%	22	2.6%	29	4.2%	Chester	92	3.5%	95	3.6%	63	2.3%	
	Grainger	183	5.3%	165	4.8%	127	3.7%		Warren	240	4.2%	238	4.1%	233	4.2%	Crockett	70	4.3%	65	4.0%	53	2.7%	
	Hamblen	551	6.3%	522	5.9%	491	5.5%		White	146	3.6%	124	3.0%	125	3.4%	Decatur	96	5.3%	80	4.4%	60	3.5%	
	Jefferson	334	5.3%	322	5.1%	305	4.9%		4	Davidson	3,378	4.1%	3296	4.0%	3191	4.0%	Dyer	349	8.5%	307	7.5%	249	5.6%
	Knox	3,879	7.8%	3728	7.5%	3230	6.2%	5	Bedford	207	3.5%	217	3.7%	212	4.2%	Fayette	107	2.8%	90	2.4%	85	2.3%	
	Loudon	284	6.0%	255	5.4%	247	5.6%		Cannon	47	2.8%	49	2.9%	46	2.6%	Gibson	370	6.1%	356	5.9%	304	5.2%	
	Monroe	271	4.8%	241	4.2%	235	4.1%		Cheatham	124	3.2%	116	3.0%	101	2.7%	Hardeman	146	3.1%	109	2.3%	95	2.1%	
	Morgan	37	1.1%	32	0.9%	36	1.1%		Coffee	366	4.9%	329	4.4%	288	4.2%	Hardin	150	3.7%	117	2.9%	108	2.5%	
	Roane	199	3.2%	181	2.9%	180	2.7%		Dickson	364	7.5%	326	6.7%	301	5.5%	Haywood	118	4.1%	113	3.9%	107	3.9%	
	Scott	135	3.2%	82	2.0%	56	1.4%		Franklin	189	3.9%	189	3.9%	179	3.4%	Henderson	311	8.4%	285	7.7%	245	6.4%	
	Sevier	557	5.4%	477	4.6%	406	4.0%		Giles	233	6.1%	214	5.6%	183	5.2%	Henry	271	6.2%	268	6.2%	218	5.4%	
	Union	247	8.7%	236	8.3%	169	6.1%		Hickman	152	4.8%	139	4.4%	133	3.8%	Lake	12	*	16	*	21	1.4%	
3	Bledsoe	49	2.1%	41	1.7%	49	1.9%		Houston	26	2.2%	24	2.0%	29	2.4%	Lauderdale	181	3.7%	163	3.3%	154	3.1%	
	Bradley	305	2.3%	313	2.3%	340	2.5%		Humphreys	109	5.4%	96	4.8%	90	4.5%	Madison	615	4.9%	546	4.4%	465	3.8%	
	Clay	32	2.5%	24	1.8%	34	2.4%		Lawrence	260	4.9%	245	4.7%	230	4.3%	McNairy	143	3.3%	155	3.6%	125	3.2%	
	Cumberland	223	3.2%	239	3.4%	208	3.0%		Lewis	93	5.3%	66	3.7%	87	5.2%	Obion	285	7.3%	303	7.8%	313	7.4%	
	DeKalb	93	3.4%	85	3.1%	104	3.8%		Lincoln	200	5.4%	174	4.7%	178	4.7%	Tipton	359	6.7%	275	5.1%	248	4.5%	
	Fentress	71	2.4%	70	2.4%	77	2.4%		Marshall	310	10.2%	262	8.6%	226	7.1%	Weakley	164	3.0%	106	1.9%	88	1.8%	
	Grundy	50	1.9%	61	2.3%	49	1.8%		Mauy	598	6.8%	588	6.7%	511	6.0%	7	Shelby	3,131	2.6%	3,133	2.6%	3015	2.5%
	Hamilton	1,635	4.3%	1503	4.0%	1494	3.9%		Montgomery	1,151	6.1%	1241	6.6%	1097	5.9%	Out of State	-	-	<5	*	<5	*	
											Top 25%	Bottom 25%											

3.3. Crisis services

Chart 37. Rate of children and youth crisis services face-to-face assessments per 1,000 population 0-17 years





Figure 5. Rate of children and youth crisis services face-to-face assessments per 1,000 population 0-17 years: FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS Office of Crisis Services and Suicide Prevention (numbers include walk-in center and mobile crisis face-to-face assessments); U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division: Annual Estimates of the Resident Population (April 1, 2011 to July 1, 2015).

Data note: Rates per county calculated by: number of crisis services in county/population 0-17 years in county*1,000.

Table 48. TDMHSAS-funded crisis services face-to-face assessments: number and rate per 1,000 population 0-17 years

PPR	County	FY2015		FY2016	
		#	Rate	#	Rate
1	Carter	85	7.83	95	8.76
	Greene	208	15.21	247	18.08
	Hancock	<5	*	9	*
	Hawkins	101	8.44	109	9.35
	Johnson	35	11.21	36	11.66
	Sullivan	363	11.61	421	13.59
	Unicoi	29	8.33	20	5.90
	Washington	322	12.90	344	13.90
Region 1		1,147	11.38	1,281	12.84
2	Anderson	185	11.64	197	12.39
	Blount	228	8.56	200	7.52
	Campbell	50	5.95	45	5.44
	Claiborne	28	4.52	29	4.66
	Cocke	74	10.02	65	8.97
	Grainger	21	4.35	10	2.09
	Hamblen	101	6.85	118	7.98
	Jefferson	99	9.06	113	10.37
	Knox	798	8.29	823	8.56
	Loudon	87	8.64	79	7.79
	Monroe	50	5.12	53	5.30
	Morgan	20	4.68	21	4.90
	Roane	125	11.97	127	12.35
	Scott	27	5.01	45	8.31
	Sevier	160	7.96	167	8.23
	Union	28	6.28	22	5.08
Region 2		2,081	8.14	2,114	8.27
3	Bledsoe	22	9.09	19	7.96
	Bradley	167	7.24	179	7.69
	Clay	6	*	6	3.89
	Cumberland	51	4.81	45	4.29
	DeKalb	26	5.98	40	9.47
	Fentress	24	6.15	24	6.19
	Grundy	<5	*	7	*
	Hamilton	541	7.28	651	8.73
PPR	County	FY2015		FY2016	
		#	Rate	#	Rate
3	Jackson	16	*	20	9.3
	Macon	30	5.31	101	17.7
	Marion	28	4.63	47	7.7
	McMinn	92	8.06	10	*
	Meigs	12	*	38	15.4
	Overton	18	*	47	9.6
	Pickett	<5	*	6	*
	Polk	11	*	36	10.5
	Putnam	150	9.51	190	12.0
	Rhea	45	5.97	35	4.7
	Sequatchie	8	*	11	*
	Smith	31	6.97	24	5.3
	Van Buren	<5	*	7	*
5	Warren	56	5.94	62	6.4
	White	44	7.62	43	7.3
Region 3		1,386	6.68	1,648	7.9
Region 4 (Davidson)		1,068	7.42	1,017	7.0
5	Bedford	83	6.79	87	7.1
	Cannon	15	*	25	8.6
	Cheatham	79	8.42	79	8.7
	Coffee	79	6.16	110	8.4
	Dickson	102	8.63	113	9.4
	Franklin	53	6.11	61	7.1
	Giles	41	6.77	55	9.0
	Hickman	41	7.70	42	7.9
	Houston	7	*	7	*
	Humphreys	24	6.01	31	17.5
	Lawrence	38	3.60	47	4.4
	Lewis	7	*	7	*
	Lincoln	29	3.84	30	4.0
6	Marshall	52	7.00	260	34.8
	Maury	196	9.72	63	3.1
	Montgomery	378	7.31	58	1.1
	Moore	<5	*	<5	*
PPR	County	FY2015		FY2016	
		#	Rate	#	Rate
5	Perry	14	*	5	*
	Robertson	152	8.88	136	8.0
	Rutherford	479	6.62	440	5.9
	Stewart	15	*	21	7.5
	Sumner	272	6.47	286	6.7
	Trousdale	9	*	7	*
	Wayne	22	7.04	18	*
	Williamson	150	2.61	164	2.8
	Wilson	179	5.89	189	6.1
Region 5		2,517	6.21	2,301	5.6
6	Benton	30	9.40	33	10.3
	Carroll	34	5.54	39	6.5
	Chester	28	7.36	16	4.2
	Crockett	14	*	28	7.9
	Decatur	7	*	17	*
	Dyer	57	6.24	84	9.2
	Fayette	22	2.70	15	*
	Gibson	81	6.74	67	5.6
	Hardeman	29	5.60	45	8.8
	Hardin	53	9.86	44	8.2
	Haywood	<5	*	8	*
	Henderson	30	4.59	38	5.7
	Henry	41	6.07	66	10.2
6	Lake	<5	*	<5	*
	Lauderdale	26	4.10	30	4.9
	Madison	288	12.73	75	3.4
	McNairy	40	6.71	18	3.1
	Obion	35	5.10	44	6.6
	Tipton	98	6.21	125	8.0
	Weakley	22	3.30	25	3.8
Region 6		943	6.64	819	5.8
Region 7 (Shelby)		1,232	5.15	1,338	5.6
County unknown		68	-	25	-
Tennessee		10,442	6.99	11,053	7.38

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Data source: TDMHSAS Office of Crisis Services and Suicide Prevention (numbers include walk-in center and mobile crisis face-to-face assessments); U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division: Annual Estimates of the Resident Population (April 1, 2011 to July 1, 2015).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for assessments <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Chart 38. Rate of adult crisis services face-to-face assessments per 1,000 population 18+ years





Figure 6. Rate of adult crisis services face-to-face assessments per 1,000 population 18+ years: FY2016



Data source: TDMHSAS Office of Crisis Services and Suicide Prevention (numbers include walk-in center and mobile crisis face-to-face assessments); U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division: Annual Estimates of the Resident Population (April 1, 2011 to July 1, 2015).

Data note: Rates per county calculated by: number of crisis services in county/population 18+ years in county*1,000.

Table 49. TDMHSAS-funded crisis services face-to-face assessments: number and rate per 1,000 population 18+ years

PPR	County	FY2015		FY2016		PPR	County	FY2015		FY2016		PPR	County	FY2015		FY2016	
		#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate			#	Rate	#	Rate
1	Carter	288	6.26	343	7.51	3	Jackson	103	11.01	137	14.63	5	Perry	33	5.38	39	6.28
	Greene	576	10.54	642	11.69		Macon	126	7.26	161	9.21		Robertson	329	6.45	353	6.85
	Hancock	66	12.58	234	44.97		Marion	210	9.39	218	9.74		Rutherford	1,199	5.54	1,612	7.19
	Hawkins	535	11.95	556	12.41		McMinn	456	11.07	526	12.74		Stewart	64	6.14	90	8.60
	Johnson	82	5.56	108	7.33		Meigs	76	8.17	91	9.71		Sumner	725	5.55	930	6.96
	Sullivan	1,856	14.76	2,254	17.92		Overton	185	10.81	205	11.90		Trousdale	58	9.39	63	10.16
	Unicoi	108	7.46	119	8.22		Pickett	34	8.15	32	7.66		Wayne	123	8.92	103	7.49
	Washington	1,382	13.65	1,407	13.85		Polk	148	11.14	132	9.89		Williamson	248	1.68	338	2.22
Region 1		4,893	12.02	5,663	13.91	3	Putnam	955	16.35	1,255	21.36		Wilson	504	5.31	613	6.26
2	Anderson	905	15.18	956	15.97		Rhea	286	11.39	280	11.18	Region 5		8,468	6.90	9,959	7.94
	Blount	636	6.38	550	5.46		Sequatchie	115	10.00	133	11.50	6	Benton	267	20.61	238	18.43
	Campbell	533	16.91	423	13.44		Smith	108	7.42	136	9.21		Carroll	348	15.65	387	17.65
	Claiborne	344	13.55	328	12.87		Van Buren	46	10.09	70	15.22		Chester	173	12.75	126	9.24
	Cocke	439	15.69	445	15.94		Warren	408	13.36	482	15.65		Crockett	126	11.37	131	11.85
	Grainger	146	8.09	179	9.91		White	296	14.42	407	19.70		Decatur	126	13.49	134	14.51
	Hamblen	1,056	21.87	1,018	20.94	Region 3		8,982	11.81	10,009	13.05		Dyer	409	14.20	530	18.45
	Jefferson	426	10.20	403	9.52	Region 4 (Davidson)		6,291	12.00	6,526	12.23		Fayette	206	6.67	196	6.28
	Knox	3,649	10.36	3,954	11.13	5	Bedford	356	10.35	406	11.65		Gibson	545	14.55	521	13.92
	Loudon	217	5.33	195	4.76		Cannon	80	7.38	73	6.67		Hardeman	222	10.68	234	11.35
	Monroe	232	6.54	260	7.27		Cheatham	129	4.25	143	4.67		Hardin	386	18.83	476	23.36
	Morgan	171	9.83	179	10.38		Coffee	514	12.60	502	12.17		Haywood	112	8.07	104	7.53
	Roane	475	11.23	496	11.68		Dickson	357	9.21	460	11.67		Henderson	233	10.85	216	8.48
	Scott	187	11.27	130	7.86		Franklin	312	9.53	418	12.70		Henry	288	11.32	291	13.52
	Sevier	509	6.79	415	5.48		Giles	236	10.35	330	14.44		Lake	45	6.99	37	5.75
	Union	104	7.10	51	3.45		Hickman	217	11.38	198	10.38		Lauderdale	280	13.31	323	15.55
Region 2		10,029	10.59	9,982	10.47		Houston	53	8.20	86	6.07		Madison	1,261	16.69	1,597	21.23
3	Bledsoe	103	8.95	96	7.92		Humphreys	108	7.64	104	16.32		McNairy	290	14.28	319	15.75
	Bradley	813	10.18	885	10.95		Lawrence	377	11.88	381	11.95		Obion	236	9.80	321	13.41
	Clay	76	12.31	100	16.05		Lewis	98	10.58	107	11.52		Tipton	612	13.35	632	13.68
	Cumberland	441	9.31	536	11.23		Lincoln	180	6.90	175	6.68		Weakley	262	9.46	243	8.90
	DeKalb	192	12.87	249	16.65		Marshall	326	13.67	245	10.18	Region 6		6,427	13.13	7,056	14.46
	Fentress	178	12.76	185	13.18		Maury	807	12.35	941	14.02	Region 7 (Shelby)		14,616	20.90	13,562	19.37
	Grundy	148	14.06	126	11.93		Montgomery	1,023	7.40	1,226	8.67	County unknown		1,012	-	1,235	-
	Hamilton	3,479	12.56	3,567	12.76		Moore	*	2.38	23	4.55	Tennessee		62,142	12.29	63,992	12.29

Top 25% Bottom 25%

Data source: TDMHSAS Office of Crisis Services and Suicide Prevention (numbers include walk-in center and mobile crisis face-to-face assessments); U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division: Annual Estimates of the Resident Population (April 1, 2011 to July 1, 2015).

Data note: <5 = number of admissions less than 5 but greater than or equal to 1; 0 events reported if applicable; *Rates not reported for assessments <20; PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Section 4: TDMHSAS prevention, treatment, recovery and rehabilitation indicators

4.1. Substance abuse services

Figure 7. Alcohol and drug abuse adolescent residential treatment sites as of 5/15/2017





Table 50. Bed capacity of alcohol and drug abuse residential treatment sites for children and youth

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16	As of 5/15/2017
1	Johnson	25	25	25
1	Sullivan	12	12	12
2	Blount	56	56	56
2	Hamblen	2	2	0
2	Knox	24	24	24
3	Hamilton	40	36	36
4	Davidson	24	36	36
5	Cheatham	8	8	0
6	Dyer	13	13	13
6	Madison	52	56	56
7	Shelby	75	75	75
Tennessee		331	343	333

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Figure 8. Substance abuse adolescent treatment sites in FY2016



Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.

Table 51. Substance abuse adolescent treatment sites

PPR	County	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
1	Carter	1	1	0
1	Hancock	1	0	0
1	Hawkins	2	0	0
1	Johnson	1	0	0
1	Sullivan	5	0	0
1	Unicoi	1	0	0
1	Washington	5	1	3
2	Blount	0	1	0
2	Hamblen	1	0	0
2	Knox	2	1	2
2	Jefferson	0	1	0
3	Hamilton	1	1	2
Tennessee		34	14*	15

PPR	County	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
3	Mcminn	0	0	0
3	Putnam	1	1	0
4	Davidson	2	3	2
5	Coffee	1	0	1
5	Marshall	0	0	0
5	Maury	1	0	0
6	Decatur	1	1	0
6	Gibson	1	0	0
6	Hardeman	0	0	0
6	Henry	1	1	1
6	Madison	3	1	2
7	Shelby	3	1	2
Tennessee		34	14*	15

Data source: Tennessee Web Information Technology System (TN-WITS), Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

*Please note that the number is smaller compared to previous fiscal years because adolescent residential programs were not funded by the department in FY2015.

Figure 9. Alcohol and drug abuse adult halfway house sites as of 5/15/2017




Table 52. Bed capacity of alcohol and drug abuse adult halfway house sites

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16	As of 5/15/17
2	Anderson	15	15	15
2	Blount	0	0	28
2	Knox	141	117	103
3	Bradley	10	10	10
3	Hamilton	60	40	40
4	Davidson	115	105	81
5	Bedford	30	30	30
5	Lewis	38	38	32
5	Marshall	7	7	0

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16	As of 5/15/17
5	Maury	32	15	15
5	Montgomery	10	10	0
5	Rutherford	40	40	0
5	Trousdale	15	7	7
6	Crockett	8	0	0
6	Hardin	24	24	24
7	Shelby	79	89	89
Tennessee		624	547	474

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Figure 10. Alcohol and drug abuse adult residential rehabilitation sites as of 5/15/2017




Table 53. Bed capacity of alcohol and drug abuse adult residential rehabilitation treatment sites

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16	As of 5/15/17
1	Sullivan	39	39	39
1	Washington	22	22	22
2	Anderson	0	0	7
2	Blount	75	82	182
2	Knox	40	46	48
2	Sevier	42	42	42
3	Dekalb	0	0	15
3	Hamilton	68	72	72
3	Putnam	18	23	23
4	Davidson	187	186	213
5	Bedford	10	10	10
5	Cheatham	0	0	0
5	Dickson	102	98	103
5	Hickman	9	21	23
5	Lewis	50	50	56
5	Lincoln	0	11	11
5	Marshall	6	6	13
5	Mauzy	32	15	15
5	Montgomery	0	0	8
5	Rutherford	8	16	53
5	Trousdale	18	26	26
6	Gibson	0	0	0
6	Madison	55	60	68
7	Shelby	265	255	256
Tennessee		1,046	1,080	1,305

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Figure 12. Substance abuse prevention coalitions in FY2016



Table 55. Substance abuse prevention coalitions

PPR	County	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
1	Johnson	1	1	1
1	Sullivan	1	1	1
1	Washington	1	1	1
2	Anderson	1	1	1
2	Blount	1	1	1
2	Hamblen	1	1	1
2	Jefferson	1	1	1
2	Knox	1	1	1
2	Roane	1	1	1
2	Scott	1	1	1
2	Union	1	1	1
3	Clay	1	1	1
3	Fentress	1	0	0
3	Grundy	1	1	1
3	Hamilton	1	1	1
3	Jackson	1	1	1
3	McMinn	1	1	0
3	Overton	1	1	1
3	Putnam	1	1	1

PPR	County	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
3	Smith	1	1	1
4	Davidson	1	1	1
5	Coffee	1	1	1
5	Dickson	1	1	1
5	Franklin	1	1	1
5	Lawrence	0	0	1
5	Rutherford	1	1	1
5	Stewart	1	1	1
5	Sumner	1	1	1
5	Williamson	1	1	1
6	Dyer	1	1	1
6	Henry	1	1	1
6	Lauderdale	1	1	1
6	Madison	1	1	1
6	Obion	1	0	0
6	Tipton	1	1	1
6	Weakley	1	1	1
7	Shelby	1	1	1
Tennessee		36	34	34

Data source: Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS), Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Figure 13. Substance abuse prevention sites in FY2016 (for individuals ages 12-25 years)





Table 56. Substance abuse prevention sites (for individuals ages 12-25 years)

PPR	County	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
1	Greene	0	0	1
1	Hancock	1	1	1
1	Hawkins	2	1	0
1	Sullivan	5	5	6
2	Anderson	3	3	2
2	Blount	1	1	1
2	Campbell	0	1	1
2	Cocke	6	6	6
2	Grainger	2	2	2
2	Hamblen	5	5	5
2	Jefferson	3	3	2
2	Knox	6	13	10
2	Loudon	1	1	1
2	Morgan	1	1	1
2	Roane	1	1	1
2	Scott	3	3	3
2	Union	1	1	1
3	Bradley	1	1	1
3	Clay	1	1	1
3	Cumberland	2	2	2
3	DeKalb	0	1	0
3	Fentress	1	1	0
3	Grundy	2	0	0
3	Hamilton	0	5	8
3	Macon	8	1	1
3	McMinn	2	4	2
3	Overton	2	2	2
3	Polk	1	1	1
3	Rhea	2	4	1
3	Van Buren	1	1	1
3	Warren	3	2	3
3	White	1	1	1
4	Davidson	15	15	15
5	Dickson	2	2	2
5	Franklin	1	1	1
5	Hickman	1	1	1
5	Humphreys	1	1	1
5	Mauzy	3	5	4
5	Montgomery	0	0	0
5	Robertson	0	1	1
5	Rutherford	2	2	2
5	Sumner	4	4	2
5	Trousdale	2	1	1
5	Williamson	0	0	0
5	Wilson	2	2	2
6	Carroll	0	1	1
6	Chester	2	2	1
6	Dyer	3	3	1
6	Fayette	6	7	4
6	Gibson	2	0	0
6	Hardeman	1	1	1
6	Henderson	7	6	6
6	Lake	1	1	1
6	Lauderdale	2	1	1
6	Madison	1	1	2
6	Obion	4	5	6
6	Tipton	4	5	5
6	Weakley	4	4	3
7	Shelby	13	15	15
Tennessee		151	162	147

Data source: Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS), Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Figure 14. Substance abuse co-occurring capable treatment sites in FY2016



Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.

Table 57. Substance abuse co-occurring capable treatment sites

PPR	County	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
1	Greene	1	1	2
1	Hawkins	0	0	0
1	Sullivan	1	2	2
1	Washington	1	1	2
2	Anderson	2	2	2
2	Cocke	0	0	0
2	Hamblen	0	0	0
2	Jefferson	0	0	0
2	Knox	7	7	5
2	Morgan	0	0	0
3	Clay	1	1	1
3	DeKalb	0	1	1
3	Hamilton	2	2	2
3	Jackson	1	1	1
3	Macon	1	1	0
4	Davidson	7	7	7
5	Bedford	1	1	1
5	Coffee	0	1	1

PPR	County	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
5	Dickson	0	0	0
5	Lewis	4	3	3
5	Marshall	2	3	4
5	Maury	1	2	2
5	Montgomery	1	1	1
5	Rutherford	1	1	1
5	Sumner	1	1	1
5	Wilson	1	1	1
6	Decatur	0	0	0
6	Dyer	0	0	0
6	Gibson	0	0	0
6	Hardeman	0	0	0
6	Hardin	0	0	0
6	Henry	0	0	0
6	Madison	4	4	4
7	Shelby	12	12	11
Tennessee		52	56	55

Data source: Tennessee Web Interface Technology System (TN-WITS), Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region




Table 58. Substance abuse co-occurring enhanced treatment sites

PPR	County	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016
2	Morgan	1	1	1
3	Hamilton	0	0	0
3	McMinn	1	1	1
3	Putnam	1	1	1
3	Warren	1	0	1
4	Davidson	1	1	1
5	Rutherford	1	1	1
5	Sumner	1	1	1
5	Wilson	1	1	1
6	Gibson	0	1	0
6	Madison	2	2	2
Tennessee		34	32	32

2017 Behavioral Health
County and Region Services Data Book

Section 4: TDMHSAS prevention, treatment, recovery and rehabilitation indicators

4.1. Mental health services

Figure 16. Mental health residential treatment sites for children and youth as of 5/15/2017




Table 59. Bed capacity of mental health residential treatment sites for children and youth

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16	As of 5/15/17
1	Carter	0	16	16
1	Johnson	47	47	59
1	Washington	32	33	33
2	Anderson	36	39	40
2	Blount	113	113	113
2	Hamblen	13	14	0
2	Knox	25	25	25
2	Roane	52	116	116
3	Bradley	16	16	16
3	Hamilton	24	24	24
4	Davidson	112	124	178

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16	As of 5/15/17
5	Cheatham	82	82	90
5	Humphreys	93	93	91
5	Maury	20	20	20
5	Perry	42	42	42
5	Rutherford	36	36	40
5	Sumner	24	24	24
5	Wilson	31	31	31
6	Dyer	15	15	15
6	Madison	53	61	61
7	Shelby	505	506	506
Tennessee		1,371	1,477	1,540

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Figure 17. Mental health adult supportive living sites as of 5/15/2017



Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.


Table 60. Bed capacity of mental health adult supportive living sites

PPR	County	# beds As of 7/1/14	# beds As of 2/11/16	# beds As of 5/15/17
1	Carter	3	0	0
1	Greene	18	10	10
1	Hawkins	8	0	0
1	Sullivan	30	30	30
1	Washington	21	18	18
2	Anderson	30	30	30
2	Blount	16	16	16
2	Claiborne	0	0	0
2	Hamblen	0	0	0
2	Jefferson	32	34	34
2	Knox	100	92	68
2	Monroe	25	25	25
3	Bledsoe	10	10	10
3	Bradley	16	16	16
3	Clay	15	15	8
3	Hamilton	155	176	153
3	Marion	10	10	10
3	McMinn	0	3	3
3	Overton	16	16	16
3	Putnam	13	13	13
3	Rhea	8	8	8
3	Warren	90	89	83
3	White	8	8	0
4	Davidson	393	366	336
5	Bedford	36	46	27
5	Cannon	28	16	16
5	Coffee	24	0	15
5	Dickson	5	5	0
5	Franklin	10	10	10
5	Hickman	49	28	0
5	Houston	15	16	16
5	Humphreys	14	14	8
5	Lawrence	0	0	16
5	Lincoln	15	0	0
5	Maury	5	20	20
5	Montgomery	8	0	15
5	Rutherford	127	105	103
5	Sumner	8	8	0
5	Williamson	16	0	0
5	Wilson	152	155	155
6	Benton	34	37	37
6	Carroll	35	0	35
6	Dyer	28	32	32
6	Gibson	10	10	10
6	Hardeman	79	79	79
6	Henry	22	22	22
6	Madison	35	35	35
7	Shelby	441	446	395
Tennessee		2,229	2,085	1933

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Figure 18. Mental health adult residential treatment sites as of 5/15/2017



Please note that the maps only display information about the locations of treatment sites. All agencies accept admissions from all over the state.

Table 61. Bed capacity of mental health adult residential treatment sites

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16	As of 5/15/17
2	Anderson	2	2	2
2	Blount	37	24	24
2	Monroe	0	0	10
2	Sevier	36	42	42
3	Hamilton	12	12	12
3	Rhea	16	16	16
3	Warren	24	24	24
4	Davidson	16	16	14
5	Dickson	26	26	26

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16	As of 5/15/17
5	Hickman	5	18	81
5	Humphreys	24	24	24
5	Sumner	25	25	25
5	Williamson	0	16	16
6	Carroll	0	0	10
6	Obion	8	8	8
6	Madison	10	0	0
6	Weakley	8	8	8
7	Shelby	62	64	35
Tennessee		311	325	377

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Figure 19. Mental health adult supportive residential sites as of 5/15/2017




Table 62. Bed capacity of mental health adult supportive residential sites

PPR	County	# beds	# beds	# beds
		As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16	As of 5/15/17
1	Washington	20	20	20
2	Knox	15	15	15
2	Monroe	0	0	8
2	Sevier	7	19	12
3	Grundy	10	10	10
3	Hamilton	42	32	62
3	Macon	8	8	8
3	McMinn	8	8	8
3	Putnam	20	20	14
3	Rhea	8	8	8
3	Warren	24	41	32
4	Davidson	143	135	121
5	Bedford	15	15	15
5	Coffee	8	61	53
5	Hickman	4	19	0
5	Maury	8	8	16
5	Montgomery	8	8	8
5	Rutherford	10	0	0
5	Sumner	20	20	26
5	Wilson	54	54	54
6	Carroll	48	48	38
6	Dyer	4	0	0
6	Fayette	8	8	8
6	Lauderdale	6	6	6
6	Obion	18	18	18
6	Weakley	16	16	16
7	Shelby	25	14	75
Tennessee		557	611	651

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region

Figure 20. Licensed mental health psychosocial rehabilitation program sites as of 5/19/2017




Table 63. Bed capacity of licensed mental health psychosocial rehabilitation program sites

PPR	County	#	#	#
		As of 7/1/14	As of 2/11/16	As of 5/19/17
1	Greene	1	1	1
1	Sullivan	2	2	3
1	Washington	1	1	4
2	Anderson	1	1	1
2	Campbell	1	1	1
2	Hamblen	0	0	1
2	Knox	3	3	4
2	Roane	1	1	1
2	Scott	1	1	1
3	Hamilton	1	1	2
3	Warren	1	1	1
4	Davidson	6	6	6
5	Bedford	1	1	1
5	Coffee	1	1	1
5	Dickson	1	1	1
5	Maury	3	3	2
5	Montgomery	1	1	1
5	Rutherford	1	1	2
5	Wilson	1	1	1
6	Benton	1	1	1
6	Carroll	1	1	1
6	Gibson	1	1	1
6	Hardeman	0	0	1
6	Hardin	0	0	1
6	Henderson	0	0	1
6	Henry	1	1	1
6	Madison	1	1	3
6	Obion	1	1	1
7	Shelby	5	5	8
Tennessee		39	39	54

Data source: Tennessee Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Licensure Database.

PPR=TDMHSAS Planning and Policy Region